DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 188 UD 020 432

AUTHOR	Fox, G. Thomas, Jr., Ed.
TITLE	Federal Role in School Reform from Sociological and Educational Perspectives.
INSTITUTION	Emporia Kansas State Coll.; Florida Univ., Gainesville.; Houston Univ., Tex.; State Univ. of New York, Albany. Teacher Education Developmental Service.; Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Teacher Corps Associates Program.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[74]
NOTE	119p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; Minority Groups; Organizational Change; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Role; Urban Areas
IDENTIFIERS	Corwin (Ronald); Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Project Head Start; *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

This monograph contains (1) five papers on issues raised in a study by Ron Corwin on the Teachers Corps program as an instrument of educational change, (2) a summary of educators' and sociologists' responses to the papers, and (3) an essay by the editor on possibilities for educational change and institutional reform. The first paper is by Melvin Tumin and deals with the issue of organizational survival in the wake of educational reform. In the second paper, author Minnie W. Koblitz discusses the implications of the Corwin report for the classroom teacher. The third paper, by Mario D. Fantini, relates Corwin's analyses to the problems of achieving educational reform in urban communities. In the fourth paper on minority groups and educational reform, Carl and Gloria Grant review the history, purpose, administration, and effectiveness of two Federal reform efforts, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Project Head Start. The fifth paper is by Martin Haberman and focuses on the issue of teacher education as an instrument for change in the public elementary and secondary schools. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185188

FEDERAL ROLE IN SCHOOL REFORM FROM SOCIOLOGICAL AND EDUCATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Papers and reactions inspired by the issues raised by Ronald Corwin's report, *Reform and Organizational Survival: The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change.*

edited by: G. Thomas Fox, Jr.

School of Education
University of Wisconsin-Madison

sponsored by:

Collaborative Model Project, College of Education
University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida

Rural Teacher Training Complex
Emporia Kansas State College, Emporia, Kansas

Professional Development Center
University of Houston, Houston, Texas

Teacher Corps Associates Program, School of Education,
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin

Teacher Education Developmental Service
State University of New York at Albany, Albany, New York

UD 020 432

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Table of Contents

Editor's Note

Preface, Dr. William L. Smith, Director, Teacher Corps

Introduction to Corwin Report, Ronald Corwin and Roy Edelfelt

CHAPTERS

1 **REFORM AND ORGANIZATIONAL SURVIVAL: A CRITICAL EVALUATION**
Melvin Tumin 15

2 **IMPLICATIONS OF THE CORWIN REPORT FOR THE CLASSROOM TEACHER**
Minnie W. Koblitz 27

3 **COMPLEXITIES OF URBAN EDUCATION AND REFORM**
Mario D. Fantini 37

4 **MINORITIES AND EDUCATIONAL REFORM**
Carl and Gloria Grant 51

5 **TEACHER EDUCATION AS AN INSTRUMENTALITY FOR CHANGE**
Martin Haberman 71

6 **EDUCATORS' RESPONSES TO PAPERS**
To Tumin Paper 84
To Koblitz Paper 87
To Fantini Paper 90
To Grants Paper 93
To Haberman Paper 96

7 **SOCIOLOGISTS' RESPONSES TO PAPERS**
Tumin 102
Corwin 110

8 **SUMMARY: SPECIFICITY AS A NECESSARY STEP TO INSTITUTIONAL REFORM**
G. Thomas Fox, Jr. 115

Editor's Note

The facts behind this collection of essays are these. A conference was to be held in December, 1973, to discuss the issues raised by the research report by Ronald Corwin, titled *Reform and Organizational Survival: The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change* (New York: Wiley Interscience, 1973). The conference was to be jointly sponsored by the National Education Association, the Office of Education, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison to encourage an analysis and debate of the issues from various perspectives of educators and sociologists. Soon after the papers were contracted and before the conference was to be held, the energy crunch of the winter of 1973-74 hit and the conference itself was cancelled. The papers, however, have proved to be too provocative to dismiss and thus are put into this form in order to encourage a wider forum for debate.

The authors of these papers are:

Melvin Tumin, professor of sociology and anthropology, Princeton University and Adjunct Senior Research Sociologist, Educational Testing Service.

Minnie Koblitz, practicing teacher, Scarsdale Public Schools, Scarsdale, New York.

Mario Fantini, professor and dean, Faculty of Education, State University College, New Paltz, New York.

Carl and Gloria Grant, assistant professors at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, specialists in multi-cultural education.

Martin Haberman, professor, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

In the order above, these papers are presented in chapters one through five.

To parallel the original intent for debate and to clarify some of the issues raised by the Corwin report, reactions to each of these papers were also requested from these five authors. In addition, responses to the five papers were requested from Donald Sharpe, a former Teacher Corps project director and professor of education at Indiana University, as well as from Ronald Corwin.

Chapters six and seven present these reactions to the papers. Since the five educators (Koblitz, Fantini, the Grants, Haberman, and Sharpe) responded by referring to each paper individually, and the two sociologists (Tumin and Corwin) responded to the papers as a whole, it seemed natural to place these two ways of responding into different chapters: responses by educators (chapter 6) and responses by sociologists (chapter 7).

The final chapter is the editor's and is less a summary than an

introduction to a more continuous and refined debate about possibilities for educational change. Again, the purpose of this collection of essays is not to communicate the results of educational research but to encourage closer inspection and a wider discussion about the realistic possibilities for institutional reform of schooling. I hope readers will recognize these essays for their provocative nature and that their reading will only be a first step at both a personal and group debate over the issues raised.

In addition to thanking the sponsors of these papers for their cooperative support, I would like to recognize the valuable assistance of Dr. James Steffensen, Chief, Program Development, Teacher Corps, in conceptualizing and supporting the preparation of these papers. M. Vere DeVault and John M. Kean of the University of Wisconsin have provided numerous ideas related to this volume. This book of readings was published at the University of Houston through the Professional Development Center. W. Robert Houston, director of the PDC, facilitated the publication process. I would also like to express a special note of appreciation to Donna Schleicher, secretary and chief organizer of our WETEP office here at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

G. Thomas Fox, Jr.
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Preface

There are two basic ways to analyze the performance of a federal agency. One is to have its goals and past activities inspected by appropriate legislative committees. The second is to secure a thoughtful analysis from professionals in the same field. The former method yields the public's judgment of the value of the service rendered. The latter approach represents the scrutiny of the agency's performance in comparison to the field's possible achievements.

Ron Corwin's study, *Reform and Organizational Survival*, subtitled "Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change," is a prime example of the second type. The work is a lucid and well documented version of certain strategies employed by Teacher Corps to upgrade the quality of professional participation in strengthening the educational opportunities available to children in areas having concentrations of low-income families. But even more importantly, it provides the educational community with a theoretical and organizational framework from which to explore the business of educational personnel development that transcends the Teacher Corps and gets at the issue of American education. Unquestionably, it is a contribution which can help the Teacher Corps.

Readers will find Professor Corwin has examined the strengths and reviewed the weaknesses of the Teacher Corps program. The value of this approach is evident, for it is through focusing on our strengths that we will be able to forge workable, effective strategies to remedy deficiencies. The study clearly demonstrates that the Teacher Corps has been most successful in attracting and developing many talented, motivated people into the classrooms of the nation which need this kind of commitment. Professor Corwin points out that it is our challenge, however, to provide more effective training designs so that the natural aptitudes and enthusiasms of the interns can be maximized to benefit their students.

In his book Ron Corwin describes the optimum conditions under which he feels educational change can occur. This monograph is a professional and appropriate response to some of his suggestions.

Two aspects of this collection make this volume particularly commendable. First, it has provided a forum for scholars outside and inside the field of education to use in communicating their perceptions of reform within education. Their reflections provide a stimulating freshness of outlook which will greatly benefit the educational professions as they seek more effective ways to improve the schooling experience in our society. Second, the reader will benefit from the authors' opportunity to engage in intellectual exchange and thoughtful controversy over salient issues.

Nevertheless, it is important for the reader to be cognizant of the fact that Corwin's original study and this response to it are based on data gathered from the initial three years of the Teacher Corps. In 1974, the program went into its ninth-year cycle. The six years between the program strategies of the third cycle and today's Teacher Corps have brought almost as many changes to the program as they have to the nation. Not all of the observations made about the first three years remain relevant today. Yet Corwin's document is a classic. The basic purposes of the Teacher Corps, like those of the nation, remain the same even though the incidentals of contemporary activities vary. Therefore, Corwin's book and this companion volume remain essentially useful to the program as it evolves to meet the fluctuating specifics of present needs always within the scope and intent of its original legislative mandate.

My appreciation goes to the National Education Association and the University of Wisconsin-Madison for the examination of these issues. They have rendered a service to the educational community by directing attention to the practical aspects entailed in providing quality education for all. The effort is to be commended.

Dr. William L. Smith
Director, Teacher Corps

Introduction to the Corwin Report

The papers included in this volume are reactions and comments to a research report, *Reform and Organizational Survival: The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change*, by Ronald Corwin.

The report was initiated by the National Education Association, funded by the Ford Foundation, and facilitated by the cooperation of the Office of Education staff of the Teacher Corps.

A few words about the purposes and procedures of the report seem essential to give the reader the context of the papers that follow.

Corwin's report was designed to:

1. Discover whether bringing Teacher Corps interns into a school changes relationships among teachers and between teachers and students;

2. Identify the distinctive changes that occur in different types of schools and universities and in different types of programs during Teacher Corps internship;

3. Discover changes in the intern's idea of their role during internship.

The Teacher Corps was recognized as a complex program. Local programs within the Corps varied a great deal. Measuring inputs and narrow program outcomes hardly seemed possible; even if such an approach were possible, it could hardly be justified because it would ignore the intervening conditions responsible for outcomes, i.e., the process.

Evaluating the Teacher Corps, then, was seen as a more difficult and complex task than setting up a controlled experiment with specific goals and measurable results. The report did not aim to determine how well the program achieved its goals, nor to arrive at a categorical acceptance or rejection of the program as a whole. It did not set out to determine whether or not the Teacher Corps "worked." Rather, it attempted to determine in what respects and under what conditions different aspects of the program were more effective than other viable alternatives. The intent was not to catalog each component of the program, bit by bit, but to arrive at a grasp, and ultimately a qualitative assessment, of the overarching but variant patterns within and among the local programs.

In addition to identifying some components of teacher education programs that seem to be relatively effective under specified conditions and some training models that were appropriate for various settings, objectives, and resources, one of the most important

outcomes of the study was to suggest approaches to evaluating complex programs and to formulate questions that can be answered by research.

The report searched for signs of improvement that might have occurred because of the program, rather than attempting to determine how the program measured up to ideal standards. A *comparative model* of research was used, measuring Teacher Corps programs at different sites, one against the other, to see what strategies, program elements, and environments produced the greatest success. Also, a *variable testing* approach was used. The objective was to understand *how* each local program produced certain effects by identifying those elements of the program responsible for the effects that were or were not produced.

In addition to structured interviews, several questionnaires were administered to measure respondents' backgrounds, occupational intentions, attitudes toward teaching, attitudes toward racial minorities, opinions on the effectiveness of the various types of people involved in the local programs, political attitudes, opinions on different segments of the Teacher Corps program and their results, and feelings about the program as a whole.

The data were collected from 10 of the 35 second- and third-cycle programs. The programs were located in various parts of the country and represented both urban and rural areas. Four were connected with schools that had predominantly black student bodies; two involved Chicano and Indian children.

When the report began, in the fall of 1968, five of the ten programs involved were in the second cycle, which began in the fall of 1967 and in their final year of existence. The other five were third-cycle programs in their first year of operation; four of these were the first Teacher Corps programs to be conducted at their respective sites.

All ten sites were visited from October 1968 to March 1969, to administer questionnaires, conduct interviews, and observe the program. A total of 1,293 individuals responded to the questionnaires—interns, teachers, and principals in participating schools, participating college faculty, and graduate students in education who were not in the Teacher Corps program; 932 of these persons were also interviewed personally.

The five third-cycle programs were revisited in the spring of 1970, to readminister the questionnaires to measure the difference a year had made in their responses. One member of the research team spent twenty days observing and recording patterns of interaction and activities at four of these five sites. In addition, the team used official records, interviewers' field notes, and diaries kept by some of the interns.

The research report is sufficiently complex and comprehensive to require analysis by and comment from educators of many dif-

ferent kinds and persuasions. The papers that follow will be of particular interest to those who have read the research report, but they also stand up alone as stimulating reading. And they begin the kind of feedback and dialogue we hope the book will provoke.

Ronald Corwin
Professor of Sociology
Ohio State University

Roy Edelfelt
Professional Associate
National Education Association

1

Reform and Organizational Survival: A Critical Evaluation

by Melvin Tumin

Since Dr. Corwin has explicitly addressed the question as to what his study of the Teacher Corps teaches us about future attempts at educational reform, one could do no better than to turn to his book and study its findings, especially those summed up in Chapter 11, in which he offers us a sociological view of social reform. There we find that five major sets of variables are crucial in determining the outcome of any attempt at innovation: power structures, resources, task structures, status characteristics of personnel, and the occupational environment. Moreover, Corwin gives us some specifications regarding the internal and external *dimensions* of each of these five variables; and for some of the variables – namely, power, resources and task structures, there is even some specification of the *values* of these variables at which innovation has the highest probability of succeeding. Fewer or none of such specifications are made, however, regarding the status characteristics or the occupational environment. Thus, Corwin asserts that if innovation is to succeed, there must be a deliberately controlled guidance system with five specified dimensions in any such a system. But he does not tell us which educational, ethnic, age and sex features are most salutary or favorable for innovation; nor what the structure of the occupational environment has to be like, except that in some general way it ought to be in harmony with the spirit of innovation.

This contrast between the presence of specifications for three major variables and the dearth of them for two others is admittedly overdrawn. But I have done so deliberately in order to highlight a very important principle regarding sociological models and their utilization in applied or clinical work, such as educational reform. Before I state that principle I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not here invidiously comparing sociological models with other possible models. That is, I am not suggesting that sociological models are in general inferior or superior to others. I would surely make the same observations about Psychological, or Political, or Economistic, or Social Psychological or Anthropological models as I am about to make about Sociological models.

With that caveat, I want now to say that between any abstract model of how a system works, and the use of that model for concrete day-to-day guidance about how to keep the system working or how to innovate within that system, there are unavoidably large gaps. The gaps are of several kinds: between the concrete and the abstract; the idiosyncratic and the general; and between the less and the more inclusive versions of reality.

An example will help here. Any competent sociologist can provide a police commissioner or an attorney general with a model of the causation of crime, and hence, inferentially, a model for the prevention of crime. Armed with such a model, one should be able

to carry out the kind of social intervention needed to reduce the rate of crime. Sociologists can provide this kind of model because the factors that cause crime are well known, including relative and absolute need and deprivation; inadequate socialization into the norms; inadequate positive reinforcement of the norms; inadequate role-models of normative success; lack of resources and hence of stake in the going system; inadequate restraints against deviation; etc.

Knowing all this and being able to specify how these variables interact to yield differential crime rates for various social groupings; we nevertheless know that this model will be useless to the concerned officials, especially if they are under pressure to do something substantial and soon. The reason for the inutility of the sociological model is the fact that the better it is as a model the less does it contain of the specifications required for social engineering in culturally-specific environments. It bears the same relationship of a practically experienced plan for the reduction of crime rates as do basic principles of physics bear to a practically engineered instrument for rocketing to the moon. The rocketeers must, of course, be guided by basic principles of physics. Yet the engineering basic physics into a working rocket requires skills, knowledge, resources, power, and the like that are nowhere specified in the basic physics model.

Lest it be thought that this gap between theoretical model and clinical application is unique or restricted to educational reform and rockets to the moon, let me hasten to cite the comparable if not larger gaps between models of social work practice and the actual practice of social work; models of psychological health and the achievement of that health; models of ideal marriages and the implementations of those prescriptions; and models of physical health and the adequate practice and delivery of good medical care.

The important observation here is that such gaps between abstract scientific knowledge and practical, clinical application are generic. The gaps cannot be closed or bridged in any particular case without a great deal more concrete specification, for which the abstract model provides no guidance, except as a kind of inventory of relevant variables. In the best of cases, as in Corwin's analysis, some specific levels of the relevant variables are asserted. But even then there is a long way to go to achieve the desired practical ends. Thus, even if I can tell a crime commission how much of a stake in the going system a person has to have in order to refrain from regular violation of the norms of that system, and even if I can specify which statuses the person has to occupy to develop that sense of stake (e.g., through integration into normative institutional rewards), the clinical practitioner is still afflicted with the problem of figuring out how in the world he is supposed to be able to provide

that sense of stake. Given the world as it is what should he do in the meantime to respond to the demands for immediate results. If that confession of impotence is taken as evidence that the system that generates unequal stakes must be altered or destroyed, such a conclusion would be one of several possible logical inferences. But it would also be practically useless and politically impossible, at least so far as producing immediate visible and significant changes is concerned.

Or to take another example, consider the case of social work. If the model of a good case worker calls for the development of empathic abilities on the part of the case worker, as a requisite for effective relationships with clients (or victims, as clients are called today), there remains the task of developing such empathy in apprentice case workers. Then there remains the still greater task of teaching them how to use that empathy to discover what the client, or victim, wants and needs. Even when that is accomplished, however, there remains the further task of securing adequate resources to provide the client or victim with what is wanted and needed. More generally speaking, everyone knows what the general characteristics are of a good teacher, doctor, scientist, policeman or attorney general. But no one knows yet how to "make" one of those things. And no one knows very well how to create the conditions in which good practitioners can effectively implement their task missions.

Lest these observations give too much unwarranted comfort to clinicians, engineers and men of practical affairs, it must now be asserted that between their daily practices and the general models of the systems in which they work, the same gaps exist. Thus, clinicians (let that be a generic word for those involved in concrete problems in specific situations) cannot know whether they are successful in their work. Even if it is agreed they have been successful, they cannot know whether they were successful because of, or in spite of, or in deference to what they did. That is, one cannot know these things without using the more general model of system behavior to estimate the relevance and weight of various factors and to connect variables to each other in a causal nexus. Most teachers, doctors, social workers, lawyers, whatever, are incapable of specifying the ingredients of their "successes" in ways that are useful to others who might wish to emulate them; and certainly not in any *generally* useful way. At best, they can offer tentative hypotheses about some of the possibly relevant variables—if, that is, one presses them to abstract and generalize from their specific and concrete behaviors. Could it be then that there is lack of correlation, or a negative correlation between the skills and talents that go into analytic model building and system analysis on the one hand, and those that go into apparently successful clinical engineering on the other?

I am inclined favorably to this hypothesis because I have repeatedly had the experience that when I address various audiences on topics within my scientific competence, I can say beautiful, sensible, coherent things on the general and abstract level of the system involved—be it a school, corporation, police force, or whatever. But I am utterly at a loss to deal with questions from the audience that begin with "Well, what would you do in a case where . . .?" And then the questioner gives me concrete specifics of a given, particular, idiosyncratic situation. The only person I know of who *seems* to be able to handle this kind of thing "successfully" is Dear Abby—and she does so by resorting to homilies, highly opinionated judgements, and very explicit values that she has no hesitation in advancing. Moreover, we have no way of knowing whether her homilies and prescriptions "work" at all.

Now I must add that I have understated the difficulties facing those who seek to innovate in large, complex systems or organizations. For the difficulties faced by the clinical practitioner working with individual clients do not include to any great degree the "system forces" that work to preserve the status quo against any and all attempts to change. Nor is there anything comparable to the obstacle presented by inadequate resources when one is engaged in an enterprise such as innovation in national educational systems. Both of these obstacles, massive entrenched system interests and scarcity of innovative resources, are without parallel in clinical work between specialist and individual client.

When we take adequate account of these two major sources of difficulty, we see that the gap between the knowledge of how things work and the ability to make them work is even greater than we had imagined. One can put it as follows: To *understand* the problems faced by an individual is one level of accomplishment; to be able to implement that knowledge effectively in the reconstruction of the *individual* life is quite another and more difficult accomplishment; and finally, to be able to reduce *rates* of disorders for large numbers of such people is a task of an extraordinarily larger scale. It is at this third level—of significant alterations of system-operations—that the resistance of established forces and the inadequacy of innovative resources—become most relevant.

Corwin's study provides the very significant reassurance that with high intelligency, scientific perspicacity and very hard work, it is possible to become wise after the fact about complex systems. That is no mean accomplishment, given that most people neither become wise after the fact nor recognize their lack of wisdom. Indeed Corwin's study is one of the best I know of ex post facto wisdom. Moreover, it informs us of the value of ex post facto evaluations—contrary to the stern injunctions about the uselessness of such evaluations. This is especially salient because pre-planned and

simultaneous evaluation of innovative efforts is almost always politically or economically impossible. But such ex post facto wisdom—for all the important value it possesses—always leaves us at a significant distance from what we need to adopt an affirmative course of action that might correct for the past mistakes and make a real difference in our next efforts at innovation.

I have dwelt on these difficulties at such length not simply to underscore a message of despair and hopelessness. For while some may see that message in these words, at least it was not intentional, however much of it may be there. Rather, it has been my intention to highlight two major delusions regarding programs for social change that characterize the modern scene. One may be called the delusion from the right (politically speaking) with a locus inside the system; and the other may be called the delusion from the left, with a locus outside the system.

The first delusion is eloquently expressed by Richard Graham, in his response (in the July, August, 1972 issue of *Applied Behavioral Science)* to Ronald Corwin's article (in that same journal issue) entitled "Strategies of Organizational Survival: The Case of a National Program for Educational Reform." Here I wish to dramatize Graham's approach, so that the delusional qualities may be clarified. The delusion consists primarily in the belief that such social reform programs as the Teacher Corps are best understood as inspired works of highly motivated individuals, sitting somewhere in the ranks of the Federal Bureaucracy, who with enough vim, intelligence and adaptability, will be able to recreate a massively complex social fabric, such as the educational system, through highly personalized political maneuvering, cultivation of the "right people" and being "realistic" enough to adapt to needs for change as they come along.

That's a bit of an overstatement of the case, but not very much, and in any event it highlights the essential delusion of personalism, if I may call it that, and the accompanying delusion of excessive optimism. The first delusion refers to the belief that inspired leaders will make the critical difference; the second delusion refers to the belief that the sky is the limit in social reform, if only all men of good will pitch in, and all bad-willed people will stop maliciously interfering with the new visionaries.

Under the guidance of these delusions, system forces that are obstacular become simply a lack of understanding by opponents who have to be sympathetically shown the light. Or, they are viewed as accidental outcroppings of unanticipated political objections which can be overcome by various kinds of deals and compromises that won't essentially detract from the core of the envisioned program of reform. Accompanying these mistaken identifications, and providing the energy needed to go on with them, is the great

pressure on "the leaders," located in places such as Graham's, to somehow "succeed" at a task that is noble but utterly marginal to the main thrust of politics at the time. In this regard they resemble greatly the various Commissions on Civil Rights, Civil Liberties, and Crime and Violence. A corollary of the need to succeed, of course, is the need to maintain political visibility; to acquire a reputation as a sound, practical person who knows how to bend with the wind; and thus to commend oneself as a candidate for future glories at perhaps a higher level of the national oligarchy when the occasion arises.

In such instances one has somehow to create for oneself the illusion that the fate of the country, if not of the world, depends on the success, at some level, of the program with which one has been charged, while one knows, deep in his heart, with a sickening sense of utter foolishness about self, that this is really an illusion. But it is the kind of illusion that enables a president of a third-rate university (or even of a first-rate university) to feel and act as though the fate of the educational system of the country depends on whether he can get the alumni to give him enough money to build a new gymnasium and football field. The trouble with these illusions (or the paradox they present) is that while they are indispensable to the successful conduct of the petty enterprises which they inflate, they endow the individual leaders of these illusionary missions with a sense of exaltation. Such exaltation is extremely dysfunctional since it leads one to cast the scene of action as though it were a morality play in which the good and bad guys will square off against each other, and, in the end good and virtue will triumph over evil and vice. Such dramatical models of social reform make it almost impossible to see oneself as one small actor inside a large arena of complex systems. An arena where changes are likely to be small in any finite period of time no matter how large or noble the intent, and even no matter, almost, how numerous the change-personnel and their resources. The illusion of exaltation proves, on the balance, to be highly dysfunctional for understanding why one has failed, as fail one must, given the visionary set of claims that are required to launch the program in a government such as ours.

I do not mean here to speak pejoratively of Richard Graham, however much it may sound as though I am doing so. The only thing I am quarreling with is a lack of perception of the complexity of forces with which he had to deal, the brute massiveness of system opposition he was bound to encounter, and the drastic modifications in the program he would have to undertake, if even the nominal shell of his program were to survive. By contrast, Ron Corwin's sociological analysis of the strategies of organizational survival stands out as a luminous clarification of the meaning of complex systems and their interlocking networks of entrenched opposing

forces and interests, and the deeply habituated resistance to change that virtually define such systems.

If I were to pick out one extraordinary accomplishment of the Corwin study, above all others, in this context, it would be precisely that revelation of how a sociological understanding of complex organizational life introduces a kind of hard-headed and realistic understanding of the nature of the political-social process that no other approach can provide. It is a curiously ironic commentary, indeed, that one should find that sheltered, academic-minded, ivory-towered sociologists such as Corwin should prove finally to be the hard-headed realists, as against the dreamy, romantic, illusionary visions of the world, and the corollary practices that characterize so-called "practical" men of politics playing the game with the boys in the back room.

I am tempted to add here—too tempted to resist it—that Graham's approach smacked strongly of the Kennedy charisma theory of politics and social change. The need to adore a leader, which caused Kennedy to be surrounded by a halo of quasi-deification, also had the consequence of commending the Kennedy style of leadership as a model of operating politics on all levels. I have personally encountered such Kennedy-inspired types at numerous levels of state and local politics, and it is remarkable how, to a man, they tried to act the part of the charismatic leader and, to a man, failed in their enterprises. They succumbed under the weight of long-established and deeply-rooted institutional arrangements whose entrenched elites reacted with a fine sense of danger and a finer sense of disdain for the boy-scout-troop-leader approach to social organization.

This is probably an unfair assessment of the history of American politics. Probably the cult of the charismatic leader starts with FDR. But after suffering a real demise through the regimes of Truman and Eisenhower, it had a chance to come alive again under the Camelotian Exudations of the Kennedys, so that many young men, now in their depressed fifties, got caught up in the mystique and suffered deeply for it. I suppose a balanced view of functions and disfunctions would argue that the momentary breath of illusionary optimism induced by Kennedy and Co. served to sustain this country for some time through some very difficult periods. Maybe so. In any event, I am referring mostly to the style and the illusion that the style as exemplified by the chief-hero can somehow be copied by his lesser fiefs and made to work at their lower depths. One can also see the illusion operating in young boys who want to be basketball stars; they obviously think that if they can only imitate the moves made by basketball geniuses, they will acquire the genius.

I said before there were two delusions: one from the right and

from within the system, and one from the left and located in some sense outside the system. I argued just now that Graham's delusions were from the right and were system-intrinsic. Now I want to specify briefly the other delusion. It is one which affords us one of the most amusing paradoxes we have had in studies of social change for a long time. It is the notion—fostered by the Teacher Corps program—that if you could only introduce change-minded change agents into the schools, they would serve to energize the schools, keep them on their toes, make them alert and sensitive, etc., etc.

The paradox lies in the fact that this was a measure designed by the indigenous leaders themselves. This was no invasion. It was a deliberately planned introduction of a foreign agent into the body educational. It is not sure that those who recruited the interns—and it is them I am speaking of—understood fully how alien their presentations of self, their political perspectives, and their notions about education and freedom would be in the school system into which they were introduced. But whether fully appreciated or not, their abrasive presence must surely have quickly come to the attention of people at the top level, or else the system of communication was even worse than one imagines.

Two errors can be seen here. One is the error of those who introduced these change agents on the notion that they would be effective shakers and quakers. For it is now clear that if they shook and quaked anything it was the securities and comforts that the professors of education, and the principals and the teachers in the classrooms had developed over time. Securities which they were not prone to surrender for any inspirational challenges to social change presented by the peach-fuzzed interns. The idea of introducing change agents sounds appealing. But the knotty problems are, who can serve in this role? How much change can they attempt? What securities will they threaten? How different can they be in age, race, class, training and ideology from the personnel whom they are supposed to incite to change?

A naive approach would urge one to introduce people into a system who will be sufficiently different to start change going. But one soon encounters the realistic facts of vested interests in institutionalized modes of procedure and how resistant these interests can be to the incitation to change. This is likely to be true in direct proportion to the discordance between the characteristics of the change agents and those of the host communities. In this case, you could not have picked a more dissonant group of people.

The delusion suffered by the interns is the second type I mentioned. It is the delusion of instantaneous salvation. This is accompanied by the false notion that one has only to exhale the spirit of purity and morality and all evil will disappear. That old fogey establishment types will be wiped away under the sudden onrush of

pure knights of the holy new grail. A great dilemma arises here and Corwin has been eloquent in indicating it: namely, how can we introduce idealistic young change-minded people into a school system and have them try to implement their ideals, while at the same time being realistic and diplomatic enough to know how to temper their ideals with mature awareness of probable resistances and with a cultivated respect for the deeply entrenched interests of others whose basic securities are threatened by the mere word called change.

I do not believe such a combination of virtues is possible: romantic idealism seeking instant salvation, on the one hand, and diplomatic, poised, sophisticated, mature appreciation of other peoples' needs and interests, on the other. They simply don't make people like that these days—and probably never have in the past, nor ever can in the future. The failure of the interns to influence the systems in directions they considered desirable revealed the delusionary character of their conceptions of social structures and social change. They really were external, alien and foreign forces in those school systems. They were from the left, so-called, insofar as they stood for an extension of individual freedom, and for the redemption of underprivileged and undertrained students that was not being achieved by the going system.

The easy response to a perception of these two delusions would be to suggest that something in the middle ground would be most salutary in future experiments. That would mean a tempered optimism on the part of the leadership; a highly modulated and moderated set of expectations; a real understanding of system forces; a renunciation of charismatic leadership, however much inspiration is lost along the way. On the part of new change agents, that would mean introducing people who are less dissonant with their host populations; people whose expectations are modest but firm; who appreciate the tenacity of institutionalized formal structural arrangements; and who work accordingly, paying respect and deference to their institutional superiors while seeking modestly to introduce change here and there, where they can.

I say that would be an easy response. One has only to coin the terms that define the middle grounds between the extreme versions that were in effect followed and practiced. But you can see that once again this is far easier said than done. The reduction in the expectations of the leadership would unavoidably mean a reduction in the claims they are prepared to make regarding what the programs will be able to do. Such a reduction in claims will then be defined by the partisans of radical change as finky establishmentarian proposals that represent nothing more than the evasion of the basic problems. I do not know therefore whether any such middle-ground program is possible—assuming, that is, that one

wants to continue with something that at least minimally resembles the Teacher Corps of the past. But that is another problem and I cannot dwell on it here. Nor, I confess, would I claim very much wisdom at all about what might work better.

It is more relevant to summarize most briefly, and in conclusion, what I think we have learned, among many other things, from Corwin's excellent study. We have learned:

(1) Large scale systems are complex organisms, and when they are interlocked in networks they are even more complex still.

(2) In all such systems there are sets of impersonal systems forces, representing the life juice of the operating functions and embodied in the role specifications and rewards that define the operating goals of the organization, whatever the ideal goals may claim.

(3) Formal rigidities are the essence of enduring organizational structures, however such rigidities sometimes result in the demise of organizations that are always under continuous scrutiny and accountability. But when, as in the case of school systems, there are no measures of accountability, and hence no way of documenting, except through political struggle, that the system is not functioning well, then formal rigidities may provide genuine insulation of the system against criticism. The rules become sufficient unto themselves, especially when they embody predictability and continuity of governance.

(4) Boundary spanners, such as professors of education, or change-minded interns, can always point out serious difficulties in the system, as measured against ideal goal statements. But the system itself can co-opt these boundary spanners by ritualized voicing of ideal goals while continuing to live on the level of their operating goals and means quite happily.

(5) Diversity of operating goals characterizes the many different cohorts of participants in the system. When there are interlocking systems, the diversity increases even more; and when, finally, there is an effort at innovation, the diversity tends to be maximized. That diversity must warn us that only the most modest expectations of voluntary support of innovation are likely to be met; and that while our horizons of possibility may have to be high for purposes of public consumption, they had better be much lower for purposes of approximating some degree of success on a realistic level.

(6) Outside evaluators, such as a sociological research team, can serve some critically important functions for persons in all places in the system network, if provisions have been made for letting these

observers loose on the scene and for listening seriously to what they have to say as they start to understand how the system works.

(7) The open confession of failure of a given program may be politically disastrous for a bureau, or a bureau chief, especially if he has further political ambitions and needs a success story to further those ambitions. But that open confession of failure is the *sine qua non* for adequate discovery of the causes of failure and of possible decent revisions of programs for future efforts.

(8) Some substantial homogeneity must exist between the change agents and those they mean to change if the client population, with all its built-in powers, is not to dig in its heels and resist at every juncture. There must be genuine, communicable and perceived sharing of deep values among change agents and clients, if change is to have any chance. Otherwise distrust, suspicion and opposition will be the rule of the day.

There is more, far more, to learn from Corwin's excellent volume. But there is more, far more to this collection of papers, too, and I want therefore to point up only one last little irony. It is the fact, as I am sure all have now noticed, that in pointing up the lessons about social change in organizations that one can learn from Corwin, I have had to stay on a level that is sufficiently general to be analytically useful for future models of social change. But in doing so, I have fully exemplified the dilemma pointed up at the outset, namely, that between the analytic model and the actual, clinical implementation, there is a gap that cannot be filled except by the kind of wise, analytic-guided, pragmatic-oriented expertise for which no good training programs yet exist.

So I close with a quotation from Clark Kerr, which, while addressed to the state of higher education in America, nevertheless has some viable implication for primary and secondary education as well. Considering the problems of innovation in higher education, Kerr said:

> "A university anywhere can aim no higher than to be as British as possible for the sake of the undergraduates, as German as possible for the sake of the graduates and the research personnel, as American as possible for the sake of the public at large—and as confused as possible for the sake of the preservation of the whole uneasy balance."

The Use of the University, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1963, p. 18.

2

Implications of the Corwin Report for the Classroom Teacher

by Minnie W. Koblitz

Reform and Organizational Survival will perform a great service for classroom teachers. Although it may not have been the original intention of this study, the inescapable conclusion is that "accountability" rests on the whole of society—it is not just a new control gimmick for teachers alone. This may seem an obvious deduction. However, the thrust of school vouchers, performance-based certification, evaluation screenings and teacher aides replacing professionals summarizes a deluge of public attacks. Corwin's analysis of the Teacher Corps as a model of change intervention proclaims the inability to isolate one of its parts or for one of its parts to be responsible for the sum of the whole.

Before I expand further on this theme, I would like to comment overall on *Reform and Organizational Survival* to explain my handicap. No one will be alarmed or surprised to hear that a teacher—any teacher—daily immersed in a classroom will find the human factors of vital concern. If the author is attempting to influence teachers, and I suspect not, he would have highlighted the significant material. To quote the author's own observation: "Statistical treatments of the innovations obscure the qualitative difference between innovative activities" (Appendix 6, p. 433).

Undoubtedly academicians will concentrate on the research—"chi square and X of N's for all scale." Teachers who work with students and teacher trainees will ask this kind of question: How many classroom teachers were working with how many interns? Although the table on pages 40-41 attempts to illustrate the number and percentage of questionnaires, I failed to find exactly under what conditions, hours, preparation, numbers of children in the class, materials and classroom resources both interns and teachers were operating. Perhaps it's obscure, but an explanation of the use of 1,255 classroom teachers for 332 interns would be more helpful. I assume that the interns were constantly in a team situation. On the other hand, if that excellent detailed list of classroom activities in Appendix 6 is descriptive, there undoubtedly is a wealth of school and community experiences which must have been shared by teachers in self-contained classrooms.

I eagerly await the NEA publication promised in the preface, *Lessons from the Teacher Corps*. I hope *that* publication will be written for teachers, present and future.

Thus, having stated my slight irritation with the statistical mode dominating the report, I am sufficiently motivated and committed to examine further the substance of Dr. Corwin's research.

He maintains that the Teacher Corps attempts to attack "two of the most challenging problems confronting education today: (1) finding effective designs for improving the education of children of poverty, and (2) guiding the impending changes in the role of the

teacher" (pp. 19-20).

Rightly so, the author cautions the reader to recognize that schools are the targets for all the nation's ills. He also raises this challenge: Can the problems of bureaucracy, reform in structure, change in community/school relations be resolved, and still preserve what is essential in schools today?

Fortunately, I need not comment on some interns' belief in the necessity of changing our system of government in order to realize necessary educational reforms.[1] In the aftermath of Watergate, it is even more essential that we examine our institutions and the process of change.

It almost goes without repetition that all children, whether advantaged or disadvantaged, need outstanding professionals in charge of classrooms. Strong support for inner-city schools with teachers trained and knowledgeable in sociological causation and empathetic to environmental deprivation is the hue and cry of all organized teachers. Bilingual programs, hot lunches, eliminating test score discrimination, providing comprehensive class management skills, and superior facilities in human relations and understanding are policy commitments of both the NEA and the AFT.

However, under his conditions of research Dr. Corwin stated: "No one knows what kinds of skills prospective teachers need to accomplish a given objective such as improving the quality of instruction in poverty schools" (p. 31). He amplifies this at the conclusion of his study by saying that "the program produced very little codified knowledge related to teaching in low-income schools, as distinct from other types of schools, that could be disseminated to new generations of teachers" (p. 377).

This is another answer to the current accountability demand reverberating throughout most of the 50 states. Already, 31 states have passed or are attempting to pass legislation on competency-based certification. The organized profession favors competent teachers. We are appalled at the efforts to mechanize and codify "competencies" such as Florida has enumerated in its thick book.

Pity the prospective teacher-in-training in New York State. Based on no valid research, the New York Board of Regents have already established a timetable when college programs must be approved as "competency based" by the State Education Department. This means that our teacher training institutions will enter into agreements with local school districts to provide increased field work and classroom teacher participation for training students. This sounds like a great idea . . . except there are *no* funds attached to this mandate for the transition on the part of institutions or cooperating

---

[1] Although I have opinions, I would prefer to have the political scientists examine that thesis.

school districts. There is *no* validated research that these programs will produce competent teachers. There are *no* alternative choices to provide for the variety of teacher training centers and disparity among school districts. Granted that 34 graduate credits may not make competent teachers, throwing all trainees onto the state's public schools may create chaos.

I said this before I read Corwin's book. Now my premise is stronger, based on his research. He validated examples of restrictions and funding limitations of the Teacher Corps program and found government or bureaucracy itself a source of difficulty which interfered with the success of the program. The descriptions by the interns of both their academic professors and their classroom teachers are proof enough that *any* change in teacher training must be carefully explored and delineated.

Dr. Corwin recognizes the basis of the strength of the teachers today (p. 277). He states the truism that where teachers and administrators had power and they *supported* a change, it could be effective. He also points out the power to subvert. We teachers have known that for years. This is a perfect example of the necessity to negotiate curriculum change and not have it imposed from above.

What are the implications for teachers today? *Reform* states that commitment to children and teaching should be the number one requirement for an individual entering the teaching profession. The NEA *Task Force on Practitioner Involvement in Teacher Education* agrees in its report and says further:

> As we progressed in our study, the obvious evidence was the overwhelming frustration of classroom teachers who are essentially excluded from the process of the preparation of educators.
>
> Additional commonalities which consistently arose were:
>
> (1) Students need early and continuous experience in interaction with children.
>
> (2) Teacher preparation must include multi-ethnic and multi-racial experiences (implies many more bilingual teachers).
>
> (3) The academic preparation of the teacher must be made more relevant to the real world of the classroom . . . .

Although Corwin's book vacillates as to whether more/less liberal, more/less structured, more/less rigidity offers more/less learning, perhaps an old teacher hand can state definite opinions.

Teachers *must* be flexible in a classroom. Teachers *must* have the background and training in individual differences. Teachers and administrators *must not* use test scores to label children. The federal

government, state, and community *must not* judge teachers by mechanized measures of student achievement alone. If "teaching for the test" brings merit and recognition, then the "humaneness" and innovation sought by excellent teachers and excellent interns will be lost forever.

The emphasis on teacher "style" is secondary to emphasis on teacher "understanding." Remember that in 12 years of public schooling, many styles will reach different children in a variety of influences. To me, the most important attributes of a good teacher are empathy with the student and intellectual challenge. I feel they are not mutually exclusive.

According to Corwin's findings, the interns stated that the co-operation of the team leaders was greater than that of the teachers. To what extent were the classroom teachers part of the planning and recognition? How much time did these leaders have to interpret their roles as supervisors of non-typical student interns? What extra duties did teachers acquire by the assignment of an intern?

I'd like to quote a positive procedural change which reflects clearly on the state of our profession: "Another procedural change that pleased teachers was for interns to relieve them during the noon hour. Whereas teachers were normally required to spend at least part of their 45-minute lunch period with their students, they were now permitted to eat by themselves while the interns took over" (p. 236).

Like all platitudinous national mirages, the "ideal" teacher (p. 80) affected me like living by the scout oath or the Ten Commandments. What about an "ideal" school community to attract this "ideal" teacher? To refresh the memory of my colleagues who are far removed and hence unaware of the liabilities in schools, this is my prescription for an "ideal" teaching environment:

(1) Strong supportive community with no serious budgetary problems.

(2) Class size no larger than 20.

(3) Special teachers for all children fostering a love of music, books, sports, art, dance, and rhythms.

(4) Supportive services of a school psychologist, social workers, speech therapists, guidance counselors, and ombudsman.

(5) Teachers in full charge of ordering classroom supplies.

(6) Duty free lunch hour (modeled after factory workers who do not have to eat with their machines).

(7) Free preparation time during school hours.

(8) Substitutes provided to permit home visits and parent conferences.

(9) Professional development and in-service training (controlled by teachers).

(10) Curriculum modification through equal teacher participation.

(11) Supervision of teacher interns facilitated by less teaching duties and time for collaboration with university faculty.

(12) Professional visiting privileges to examine and evaluate education programs in other schools.

(13) Teachers assistance in recruiting and hiring, evaluation, and promotion to tenure.

(14) All administrators functioning as part-time teachers.

(15) Periodic self-renewal through professional development leaves in collaboration with university faculty.

(16) Teacher salaries higher than administrator salaries to keep *good* teachers with children.

I will guarantee that under these ideal conditions there will be little of: "Disillusionment with the program and with schools appeared to be associated with disillusionment with teachers" (p. 106). I will also stake my reputation on improved learning. If there exists any desire for me to project the future in the organized profession, I think you will find more and more of these 16 points included in contractual agreements between teachers and school boards. Surely these points could distinguish the special super-institutions of teacher training cooperating with the ideal school districts.

Perhaps the next step for private research funding is to seek these "lighthouse school districts" to try to approximate the ideal. I remember an experiment in Rochester, New York, where an inner-city school was established to attract suburban children by its supe-

rior building and curriculum. What happened? Have we learned anything in the past ten years since that effort was made?

How can we deal with the reality of incompetence and frustration due to overwhelming school problems? Sometime we have to begin by recognizing that not every student should be admitted to the profession. We want higher standards, just as we needed higher salaries to attract more men into the profession.

Quoting the report of the NEA Task Force on Practitioner Involvement:

> The Task Force discovered a great deal of agreement about the *necessity* of involving the practicing teacher in preparation programs. It was also discovered that, with few exceptions, much of such involvement is patronizing and dehumanizing to the practicing teacher. Practicing teachers are bored with admonitions and futuristic threat-loaded predictions about teacher education. What they crave is action now based upon established justice and intelligence.
>
> For example, why should it be so rare for practicing teachers to be involved in the continuing development of professional preparation? What is now the exception should be the standard mode.
>
> Why are teachers assigned student teachers in addition to an already maximum teaching load? Why should a profession continue to accredit preparation institutions that would allow this to happen? Why don't teachers, through their associations, have a greater voice in this?

Then the report continues to discuss the preparation of teachers as controlled by higher education and its disregarding of the profession at large.

Perhaps it will not surprise the participants to learn that until two years ago, visiting accreditation teams to teacher training institutions rarely included elementary and secondary classroom teachers. When the NEA began to assert itself as more than a *token* member of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, changes began to become apparent. At this time, higher education is developing an affinity, albeit a suspicious one, with the practitioner in the schoolroom. My prediction is that this unity will improve teacher education. Yes, not every institution should be preparing teachers . . . selectivity of both students and their training, a fifth intern year, and models closer to the medical and legal professions are road signs of the future.

We must be very cautious, as Professor Corwin notes on page 117, about adopting a single model approach, such as a "human-

istic" one without building necessary academic standards. We have room for a variety of techniques and personalities in our field as long as we maintain high standards.

If every prospective teacher had a fifth year of training or internship as the NEA *Task Force* recommends, it would serve as a screening process similar to the process of the other professions.

To me, the most interesting part of the Corwin study was the Teacher Corps interns' descriptions of their role in the classroom. At the risk of sounding repetitive and defensive, I fully understand the source of some friction without condoning it. It "often meant that cooperating teachers were not given the time or financial incentive to set up systematic training experiences for interns" (p. 123).

How many programs consider classroom teachers as Academic Adjuncts who are in the classroom part-time and on college campuses in seminars with future teachers the remaining part of the year? Corwin has certainly given us sufficient evidence to reorient our focus to this kind of change.

The team approach as evaluated in this volume is reflective of some "team teaching" that goes on in our schools today. Perhaps the Teacher Corps team leaders were more successful than the classroom teachers because they were providing managerial rather than only teaching skills. It is interesting to note that the interns largely found that their most successful experiences were non-institutionalized, such as community projects or science outside the classroom (p. 144).

Again this demonstrates the need for planning without the pressures of imposed curriculum and rigid scheduling. This also indicates why many alternate schools flourish on flexible modes. How long innovation can be sustained and high interest level maintained is another question.

I raise another issue which Corwin attacks head-on. I have grave doubts that a school can adopt change by starting with the central administration and then forcing change on teachers. More and more, by contract and design, teachers participate in planning curriculum changes and their own in-service education. Central school district administrations find their investments are more effective this way. Here is another example of the need for college faculty to include elementary and secondary teachers in planning teacher training programs. This collaboration and interaction will encourage diversity and innovation. Otherwise you have the self-perpetuating model which so many interns found frustrating.

I am very sympathetic with interns who were radicalized by their teaching experiences. This is a positive sign that teachers must be politically active for the benefit of children and the future of education. Of course, the interns felt frustrated in being "co-opted" by

the system. Would taxpayers have it any other way? Yet, if you follow the rash of due process cases affecting teachers all over the United States, teachers are out of the closet of nonentity and in the limelight of political action. Here again there can be meaningful collaboration with their university colleagues.

Another significant outcome of this study was the regional and political differences between the teachers and the interns, neither prepared for the other. Although I am reluctant to ascribe generalities to one situation, it is noteworthy that school personnel who were in greatest turmoil over the interns reflected conflicts and resentments over Northern white-liberal interns working with Southern black teachers. Again, even considering the ambivalence on the part of teachers, they clearly had little conditioning or preparation—more sensitivity on both sides was called for.

For the uninitiated, an illustration of the typical student teaching field assignment will strengthen the need for improved circumstances.

Usually the building principal assigns a student to a teacher. The principal's motives may be mixed: the teacher with the largest class (because more assistance is needed), the teacher with the smallest class (because the teacher has more time), the best teacher or the poorest, or longevity in teaching may be deciding factors. Occasionally, principals approach those teachers who are willing to accept a student teacher. Again, there are mixed motives in volunteering for this assignment. It may be the college credits offered by the higher education institution, it may be the $50 or $100 a semester compensation, it may be the extra needed helping hands, or it may be a professional obligation.

The additional responsibility is some devised or extemporaneous means of supervision. If the classroom teacher is a "model worth emulating," the trainee is fortunate. Many times the student teacher, like the Teacher Corps intern, feels frustrated by the gap between theory and practice. Frequently the student is familiar with the latest educational lingo, be it open, humanistic, free, or alternate. Rare indeed is the classroom teacher who has time to communicate fully with the university and the student to complement the on-the-job experience with the academic preparation.

While I cannot presume to speak for the entire NEA membership, it is appropriate to make a few summarizing remarks about the organizational direction relating to the Corwin study. Since the NEA is firmly established as a "teacher" power base, all facets of the educational establishment will respect its role. The NEA is galvanized into action on "accountability" with a deep commitment to professional governance.

If higher education encourages the collaboration for teacher training, institutions will improve in quality; a rejection could mean

further deterioration and loss of students. And school districts could learn from higher education the art of "grantsmanship" and the research necessary to improve increased teacher participation.

In conclusion, I think Professor Corwin has provided an excellent summary: ". . . before professional reform can be implemented, it is first necessary to adapt the education organizations concerned so that the reforms can be accommodated by them" (p. 363).

3

Complexities of Urban Education and Reform

by Mario D. Fantini

In *Reform and Organizational Survival*, Ron Corwin provides us with new opportunities to analyze institutional behavior. While his study of the Teacher Corps provides important insights relating to the problems of teacher socialization, Dr. Corwin's implications extend well beyond this more limited objective, and into the broad domain of institutional change. It will be the purpose of this paper to relate some of Dr. Corwin's analyses to the problem of achieving educational reform in our urban communities.

At the outset, it must be stated that, at best, this paper will deal only with a limited number of factors, and does not claim to provide a definitive analysis of the complexities surrounding urban school reform.

Some of Dr. Corwin's implications will be weighed against a set of interrelated forces which are operative in urban education. Included in this set of forces are:

(1) *Racism*. There is an underlying psychology of white supremacy which prevents basic institutional change and reform from being accomplished. Racist attitudes present in the larger political context of the city, state and nation are reflected as well in the institution. In a variety of overt and covert ways, the institutional arrangements discriminate against non-White participants.

(2) *Unionization of Teachers*. The political and economic aspects of urban living have forced teachers to unify into strong unions. Unions are able to generate teacher power and better enable teachers to compete in the political power arena in which urban schools function. Unionization makes the teachers an independent group which can veto or facilitate educational change. It also serves to force parents, students and other community residents to organize into groups for the purpose of political action. Also, unionization of teachers establishes a management-labor dichotomy among professionals, resulting in divided loyalties.

(3) *Diversity and Cultural Pluralism*. As minorities converged on public schools, the fact of cultural pluralism became an increasingly important factor. Blacks, Latinos, Asians, Native Americans began to emphasize their cultural heritage. They expected the schools to reflect their own cultural styles. Consequently, cultural differences, i.e., diversity itself became a value, having important implications for satisfying community aspirations and for increasing the school's productive capacity—rather than being viewed as an unfortunate barrier to homogeneity. In the past, especially in

urban centers, schools performed an acculturation function, i.e., trying to "melt" cultures into one colossal American mainstream pattern.

(4) *Uniformity in Pattern of Schooling.* Partly in order to equalize educational opportunities, the schools developed a sameness. School buildings were built that resembled each other, curricular packages became standardized, as did the tests to evaluate student growth, teachers were certified in similar ways, etc. The aim was to make this pattern of education work for everyone. We set in motion vast supervisory networks in school improvement efforts aimed at improving this one monolithic approach to education. Any new money was spent in additive ways, i.e., adding on to its basic structure, or trying to compensate various parts of it, e.g., remedial education.

However, the convergence of diversity on the uniform nature of public education posed severe problems. The standardized momentum of public schools, especially in urban centers, forced everyone to adjust to the standardized pattern. Those who adjusted received the sympathies of the institution. Those who did not were classified in ways that made the institution dysfunctional to their aspirations, i.e., students were labelled as "slow," "disruptive," "disadvantaged," "deprived," etc. The institution slowly learned that a way of classifying human beings is a way of thinking about them and generating a psychology of expectations which could have detrimental affects on human growth and development.

(5) *Change-agent Strategy.* There seemed to be a growing sense among educational leaders that administrators were change-agents, i.e., their role was primarily one of identifying the direction of change and for stimulating the institution to move in accordance with that direction. In many quarters, the change-agent strategy was translated to mean "pushing" others into sought-for directions. This is a strategy basically of *imposition.* This administrative strategy has had limited success and has alienated those who view themselves as being pushed in directions they did not want to take. It is clear that the process by which change is achieved is as important as the ultimate change itself. Given the management-labor dichotomy which has resulted from unionization of teachers, the change-agent approach is giving way to a balance of power approach to change. Increasingly, the strongest political agent dictates the direction of change. In a politically-laden atmosphere, vested interests become the prime agenda, sometimes at the expense of the welfare of the learner.

(6) *Power Politics.* Urban schools are increasingly in a maelstrom of power politics. An array of politically and economically motivated agents latent in any urban center can be unleashed over any crisis, including those that are racial or religious in nature—those that deal with numbers of incidents, such as finances, collective bargaining, etc. Any given issue, therefore, has to be weighed against a political force field in which certain elements will be for and literally an equal number against any given proposal. Increasingly, the problems of urban education, as matters of public policy, become open to *all* political forces. This makes any proposed change extremely difficult to implement. In recent years, such desperation change effort as decentralization, community control, performance contracting and vouchers have been subjected to the dynamics of urban school politics.

It is impossible to isolate these forces from the dynamic context in which they are manifest. Stated somewhat differently, these individual strains do not operate in isolation from one another or from a particular setting, and the mix is difficult to decode. However, both the density and the intensity of the forces seem to be of a greater order in the urban setting. Together, they arouse the passions of the human community. This *emotional* or *psychological* element, alone, therefore, makes it impossible to determine courses of action. When the element of frustration is introduced as a basic component of the urban political force field, then unpredictable behaviors will also result. Consequently, any attempt to intellectualize from such a reality base is fraught with hazzard, and no one analytic model can hope to deal effectively with so volatile a phenomenon. Nonetheless, for our purposes, it is still a useful professional exercise to attempt to apply certain elements of Dr. Corwin's *refined* multi-stage model of the innovative process.

Before proceeding, however, it is well to emphasize that no analysis of urban education can escape the important, practical lessons which have been learned from all the intervention efforts of the past decade. Among these salient lessons are:

1. Compensatory, add-on, more-of-the-same efforts have limited rewards.

2. No one approach to education works for everyone.

3. Imposition of a plan invites divisiveness, hostility and power politics.

4. New money used in old ways does not seem to increase educational productivity.

5. Participation by the agents closest to the action, parents, students and teachers, is important to program understanding, support and implementation.

Any urban education reform plan that is proposed today must demonstrate that, indeed, it has learned these lessons. This is an enormously difficult task as we can judge from the poor response given to such contemporary reform proposals as urban school decentralization, performance contracting and educational vouchers. An attempt will be made to suggest a contemporary school reform proposal that takes these practical lessons into account while responding also to some of the lessons learned by Dr. Corwin in his review of the Teacher Corps.

Initially, however, it might be useful to weigh the overall change strategy employed by the Federal Government through the Teacher Corps program against some of these urban forces.

Dr. Corwin reminds us repeatedly of this status in his book—that the real purpose of the Teacher Corps was not simply to provide additional assistance to so-called disadvantaged learners, but, rather, to serve as an agent for changing the institution in which poor children were being taught. The mission of the Teacher Corps, therefore, was to change urban schools and, in turn, serve as a model for changing the mainstream schools of America. The underlying assumption was that the entire educational system was in need of reform and that this federally sponsored program could serve as a primary triggering device for the major overhaul of American education. Given the public policy priorities of the mid-sixties, with its emphasis on direct federal aid, and given the legitimizing of attention to the educational problems of the poor, the notion of "using" the occasion of poverty as an important beachhead for public school reform seemed to make sense. The perceived plan of gradually building a power base with sufficient critical mass to alter the institutional arrangements for not only the poor, but for all children, appeared logical. This ambitious plan was also based on the assumption that the basic power sources for sustaining reform energy through the Teacher Corps were 1) the Federal government, 2) a coalition of disadvantaged populations (Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, etc.), and 3) an alliance with the liberal elements of society. In one sense, this was a type of "revolutionary" strategy in which the oppressed groups were united by sympathetic liberals in an overthrow of existing arrangements. This so-called "Trojan Horse" theory of change, i.e., using the problems of the disadvantaged as a smokescreen for dealing with the reform of American education, did not work. It demonstrated a gross naivete with reference to understanding political power arrangements, including inter- and intra-institutional politics.

No major reform of our educational institutions can take place without the approval of the mainstream of American society, i.e., middle America. The notion that this could be done by mobilizing the poor in an overthrow of the affluent simply does not take into account the realities of existing power arrangements. Moreover, it fails to acknowledge the basic forces of *racism* which are operative and which are aggravated by minority mobilization. On the one hand, the idea that a Teacher Corps for Blacks and other minorities could serve as a *model* for mainstream America swims against the tide of racism. In more direct terms, seldom are educational programs for Blacks models for Whites. As long as the Teacher Corps intervention was limited to the ghetto schools, that is, to "them," then mainstream America would be tolerant of such experiments.

However, it should also be underscored that during the sixties, important changes were taking place in the minority communities themselves. The liberal policy of desegregation was slowly being replaced by a more conservative, self-determination trend. For example, Black alliances with liberals to achieve school desegregation were being replaced by calls for Black unity and for community control of Black institutions. Blacks were determined to solve their own problems in a racist society. A new cadre of Black leaders began to raise serious questions about the value of coalitions with so-called Black and White liberals that would continue to perpetuate dependency relationships for most Blacks; that liberals were being perceived increasingly as "do-gooders" who would start things, but who had little perseverance to see things through to the end; that they could afford the luxury of dabbling; that the real solution to the educational problems of the poor were vested with parents and the minority community itself, with their ability to supervise the reform of their own schools.

In addition, in the pursuit of quality education, the shortcomings of desegregation and compensatory education had left many minority parents frustrated. Increasingly, quality education through schooling had become a survival need for minorities. Parents and other community residents pointed to the low achievement scores in basic skills as a primary indicator of the deterioration in the quality of education in urban schools. As such, many parents became increasingly concerned with basic skills. They wanted their children to be at grade level in reading, writing, arithmetic, etc. Other elements of the community saw the schools, in political terms, as important agencies through which the next generation of minorities could learn the political skills for fighting racism and oppression. In short, among minority communities, a divergence in aspirations began to surface. These differing frames of reference converged on all elements of the school, including the Teacher Corps.

Given this brief overview, it is not difficult to perceive how White, liberally-oriented Teacher Corpsmen would find it difficult to win the broad acceptance of minority communities. In their eagerness to "set things right" with the schools, many Corpsmen "took on" established teachers on the assumption that they—the Corpsmen—had the community with them. When the honeymoon of sympathy with the poor was over, Teacher Corpsmen were subjected to the same accountability as other teachers. Thus, many Corpsmen, by virtue of the process by which they were prepared, did not adequately master the teaching of the basic skills. This made them suspect with a portion of the community. They were also White and liberal. This "turned off" another sector of the community. If a program such as the Teacher Corps happens to side with the minority community over an issue such as, say, school decentralization, then they face the ire of other political groups who may oppose such plans, e.g., the teachers' union. Similarly, professors who themselves were not prepared to deal with the urban context, were interested in broader aims. In certain quarters, they were perceived as experimenting with the hearts and minds of ghetto children. Consequently, White Corpsmen became an object of suspicion for self-determiners in the community and for parents interested in basic skills, who felt that Teacher Corpsmen were too lax, too permissive.

The Teacher Corps also was insensitive to intra-institutional politics. For example, the established teachers who had been in the schools for years and who were made to appear inferior by the young Teacher Corps interns. Further, if senior teachers were made to feel inferior by Teacher Corpsmen, then negative information about the Teacher Corps can reach the teachers' union. It is not clear, therefore, whether the "model" was established for the urban community or the urban school, let alone the nation.

Secondly, Dr. Corwin makes the point that an institution such as the school has a life of its own which it seeks to maintain. An institutional environment is created which shapes the attitudes and behavior of those within its boundaries. For example, institutional racism is learned by the participants when learners are classified into groups with labels such as "disruptive," "slow," "underachiever." Classifying human beings generates an institutional psychology of expectations which forces those who participate to adjust to the existing pattern of schooling. Institutional racism affects most of the participants of the institution, regardless of race. That is to say, most teachers and administrators, Black or White, learn the established ways of the institution. Kenneth Clark, the noted psychologist, in his study of the predominantly Black (students and staff) Washington, D. C. public schools, reported that the same "racist" patterns were established in this school system

as in those which were predominantly White.

Any innovation, i.e., any departure from the normal day-to-day functions, is suspect. This happens naturally. An innovation is analogous to an alien element penetrating the established order. Ofttimes this innovation is accomplished by a fanfare of PR which skews attention in favor of the innovation and at the expense of existing arrangements. Innovations promise a great deal. They raise expectations of the participants and, crucially important, they sometimes base their own existence on the shortcomings of conventional programs, that is, in order to justify the innovation, criticism is levelled at what is. This affects the internal political arrangements of the institution. Those who feel slighted, usually the majority, solidify their ranks in opposition to the invader. Those who are connected with the innovation then look to administration and the funding source itself for support. If the administrator gives support, he becomes vulnerable with the majority on the faculty. On the other hand, if he sides with the status quo, then his own image as an educational leader might be adversely affected with the superintendent of schools or the school board. In the case of the Teacher Corps, because money was made available, many institutions became interested without giving sufficient attention to preparing the intra-institutional political arrangements for the innovation.

Given the overt racist orientation of our society, it would have been a more realistic strategy to begin the Teacher Corps as a mainstream model. Certainly advantages might have accrued from such a proposal. For instance, it could have thwarted certain attitudes within minority communities that "special programs" are mounted only for "them"—connoting a disdain for efforts that revealed a "special" (meaning inferior) status for minorities that necessitate atypical help. The question which reflected this view ran somewhat as follows: "Why isn't the same thing being done in the middle class white suburban schools?"

Obviously, national priorities are set in terms of need. During the 1960's, the need for better education seemed to focus on the poor. Once new programs were mounted with the poor, those professionals involved began to sense that the basic educational assumptions being utilized applied to the non-poor as well. That is to say, that the educational aspects seemed valid for all children. It was just good education. However, the overall perceived association of the new program was with the poor. If the national government had attempted to start the innovative process with the affluent, enormous criticism would have been triggered for neglecting critical areas of need. The so-called American public is not tuned into overall reform strategy. However, we now have benefitted from the lessons of the 60's. The need for institutional reform continues. In fact, President Nixon started his Education Message of 1970

with "American education is in urgent need of reform." Mainstream America is more aware of "the educational crisis." The 70's appear to offer more opportunities to parlay the lessons of the past into a balanced plan for school renewal that is more mainstream oriented.

Given the cultural pluralism which operates to a high degree in urban contexts, with its different conceptions of quality education, and given the political power arrangements that have been described, it is clear that the overall organizational strategies of *centralization* and *imposition* will have to be replaced by one that is more *decentralized* and *participatory*. Both of these elements are given considerable attention in Dr. Corwin's model.

Among the variables included in Dr. Corwin's refined model are:

(1) Promoting the development of latent sub-cultures within organizations as a way of promoting change.

(2) Dispersing of resources as a means of promoting support with its dissipating consequences.

(3) Value consensus as a primary source of incentive and constraint motivating reform programs.

(4) Goal-setting as a bargaining strategy.

These variables seem to have particular relevance to any new strategy of reform in urban schools. For example, when consumer-oriented groups with differing views of quality education converge on the educational institution, the tendency toward political polarization is increased. As suggested earlier, sometimes a tug-of-war results between and among the diverse participants. Sometimes a coalition surfaces which proceeds to control a dominant form of education for the school or district. However, such imposition results in the continuation of latent tension and hostility. The educational environment continues to be plagued with disturbance. On this point, it is interesting to note that at least one of Dr. Corwin's variables can be interpreted in a number of ways. I refer to the "value consensus" variable. If this is interpreted to mean that the dominant groups will control the direction of innovation, then in certain urban centers, at least, this may continue to pose serious problems for it appears to have a "majority rule" connotation. However, the pluralistic dimensions of urban education which have been emphasized mediate against such an interpretation. Rather, the search is for *unity* with *diversity*—and it is from such a perspective, therefore, that I view value consensus. Let me explain further.

If the different groups that have an interest in urban educational

reform are placed in a situation in which their values appear to be up for review and compromise, then emotional reaction would be engendered. Rather, it appears to me that consensus can be achieved through a process which seeks unity on the common goals held by the diverse participants. Both the process and product of educational goal setting is unifying. From my experience, with pluralistic social systems, agreement on educational goals is not the major issue. Most people will agree that schools ought to have a common and comprehensive set of objectives. These educational objectives usually include: (1) basic skills such as reading, writing, computation, learning-to-learn skills such as inquiry and critical thinking, (2) talent identification and cultivation, (3) preparation for basic societal roles such as worker, citizen, consumer, (4) having each learner acquire positive feelings of self-worth. Stated as ends, these educational goals would hardly trigger serious opposition and unacceptance among any of the parties at interest. The problem has been and continues to be, and, this point is crucial, the *means for achieving these common objectives*. On this point, most communities are divided, including those in urban areas, and they continue to be the major obstacles to school reform. To continue a group consensus pattern which seeks control of both the ends and means of education is to continue to swim against the emerging political tides. It appears to me that we need a more decentralized decision-making structure. The closer we can place decision-making into the hands of the *individual* parent, teacher and student, for achieving the means to common ends, the more likely we are of obviating some of the negative consequences related to the power politics of urban education.

Therefore, there are two aspects to decentralization that I would be considering in Dr. Corwin's change model. The first I have already mentioned and has to do with giving the individual rather than the group the power of decision-making. It appears to be more desirable at this point to give the *individual* parent, teacher and student decision-making power. At present, *organized groups* of parents, teachers and students are more apt to be the decision-makers.

The second element of decentralization is programmatic and increases the educational options leading to the common educational objectives. This type of institutional decentralization establishes a range of legitimate educational environments (each equally valid) from which individual parents, teachers and students can choose. Such a framework, if handled sensitively, can promote the development of "latent sub-centers within organizations as a way of promoting change." Such an institutional arrangement does tend to "disperse resources, and does change the political climate." The politics of *imposition* and *change* are replaced by the politics

of *individual attraction* and *choice;* having the majority dictate one pattern of education that will be imposed on a diverse human community will be replaced by a framework of educational alternatives based on choice. Further, the so-called change-agent strategy of change which is based on the assumption that certain agents identify the direction of innovation and then assume responsibility for the administrative manipulation of the diverse elements in the institution to proceed accordingly. Such an approach fosters the politics of resistance. Rather, the choice change-model is based on *attraction.* Individuals choose a particular educational environment because they are personally attracted to it.

Since we have learned from the past that no one pattern of education can work for everyone, and this includes teachers as well as students, the optional plan enables teachers to select an educational approach that is more congruent with his or her style. The same is true for students and parents. Attraction and choice should increase psychic satisfaction for these basic socializing agents that are closest to the action (parents, students, teachers). Moreover, this pattern reverses the bureaucratic top-down flow of decision-making which historically has been in operation and substitutes, instead, a more shared and cooperative procedure. As such, the choice approach to change is much more of a grassroots development and makes the educational administrator the orchestrator, facilitator, who can open channels of communication to all parties of interest—who can help create educational communities which are smaller, more intimate, and perhaps more humane.

An alternative education approach would also be responsive to the rising tide of public accountability. It is an educational consumer-oriented plan which relies a great deal on his satisfaction. In addition to returning decision-making into the hands of the consumer, this plan encourages his participation in the development of educational alternatives.

Economically, the plan is based on the assumption that the resources that are already available can be utilized differently. It is not based on more money being used for more of the same. Instead of concentrating all the resources on the improvement of one form of education, in this case the standard approach that has developed over the past century, the plan utilizes existing resources to develop alternative educational environments such as non-competitive, Multi-Cultural, Schools Without Walls, Montessori, etc.

It is crucial to point out that the standard environment continues to be a legitimate educational option, with as much as sixty per cent of teachers, students and parents continuing to select it. However, it is no longer the only pattern to which all must adjust. With this diversification in educational programs, the so-called dissatisfied

educational consumers can now have access to styles of education which were not previously available and which could have contributed toward resentment. Under an education-by-choice arrangement, teachers who are already on payrolls but who are presently forced by the normative pressures of established institutions to conform, will have their own styles of teaching liberated. As indicated, many teachers can continue to feel comfortable in standard environments, but also teachers with differing styles can now begin to have the institution respond to their strengths as well. A choice plan increases opportunities for matching teaching-learning styles, increasing the opportunities for having the school reflect the cultural modes of the participants. Since alternative schools will at times be "starting from scratch," many community-oriented ideas can be developed at the start. Moreover, optional education can take place at the classroom level, for example, standard, British Infant type, Montessori, Behavior Modification, etc. Or, alternatives can take the form of schools-within-schools, e.g., instead of having one elementary school for 600, this structure could facilitate three sub-schools of 200 each. One could be standard, the second could be multi-cultural, and the third could be a school without walls. Alternative education could also take the form of separate schools with their own building space.

We already have indications that some of our major cities are beginning to consider the implementation of alternative education, including New York, Philadelphia, Minneapolis, Berkeley, etc.

Most of what I have been talking about so far under the theme of alternative schools is directed at public schools. I am not proposing a "voucher" plan as conventionally conceived by such proponents as Milton Friedman and Christopher Jencks. Rather, I am concerned about public education where 85 per cent of all students attend, including almost 99 per cent of all minorities. The Public Schools of Choice plan is primarily a mainstream approach to reform, but has implications for urban education. For example, it is also interesting to note that part of the history of alternatives can be traced to experiences in urban education. For instance, in the earlier days of the Civil Rights Movement, temporary Freedom Schools were set up in church basements. Somewhat later, we had urban independent schools set up, such as the Street Academies, Harlem Prep, etc. Therefore, the notion that there are "other ways" of educating children has already begun to win acceptance in many quarters of urban communities. When the community has access to educational alternatives, which include the standard, then we are more likely to meet the concerns of a pluralistic community seeking differing means to common ends.

Further, optional education reduces the need for human classification, a basic element of institutional racism. The plan for reform

suggested here is not based on a status difference among options; it is not the same as vocational education, special education, schools for unwed mothers, schools for dropouts, etc. These "options" carried with them an ego-damaging status. The participatory nature of this plan insures a built-in, continuous evaluation feature which is more cooperative than devisive, and reduces the politics of confrontation. Further, the optional pattern of education is non-exclusive.

On another critical area, alternative public schools need not cost more money, but utilize existing resources differently, e.g., physical plant, teachers, materials, etc. This does not mean that we do not need more money for public education or that seed money is not important. In fact, the role of the Federal Government and other funding sources is brought into sharper focus. For instance, Title III can be used to help in the planning of alternative education, as conversion capital, bringing people together for the purpose of implementing legitimate educational options. Other Federal monies can be used for retooling of professional staffs or for providing information aimed at public education so that families can make wiser decisions.

It is also interesting to note that under a public schools of choice system, the Teacher Corps could have been useful in working with alternative school environments. There seems to be a compatibility of the thrust of the Teacher Corps and the flavor of the alternative schools movement at this time. In fact, the Teacher Corps could have been one of the first teacher preparation vehicles that are associated with the alternative schools movement in this country.

Of course, I have been reading into some of Dr. Corwin's implications that support my thesis that public schools can be reformed through educational alternatives. As such, I have perhaps stretched Dr. Corwin's implications to what I perceive to be the next stage of serious reform that will take place in American education. There are some elements of Dr. Corwin's model which may not fit the alternative education framework. For example, I am not sure how to interpret the variable of "promoting change by maximizing the leverage of the more change-oriented, cosmopolitan member institutions." However, the overall model developed by Dr. Corwin still has the ring of a small group trying to mastermind change and, therefore, has a certain Rand Corporation style to it which does not seem to connect with an important set of forces that are at work in most of our educational communities.

Obviously, there are many more facets to institutional reform, and I am grateful to Dr. Corwin for giving us a new set of tools with which to engage this important process.

4

Minorities and Educational Reform

by Carl and Gloria Grant

Introduction

The United States has experienced three major periods of educational reform—those of the nineteenth century, the Progressive Era, and the one which we are experiencing today.[1] Each of these three periods can, in a certain manner be compared to a kite, for all were launched on the winds of social change and all were initially given great lengths of string, enabling them to sail high into the sky. Each of these periods, however—and the subject of this paper will be the current period of educational reform—has been also like a kite in that eventually the winds that raised it aloft have diminished, the lengths of string have been pulled in, ultimately bringing the kite down from the sky. And after the kite has fallen or been pulled from the sky, it is often difficult to assess what, if anything, was really accomplished by its flight. The kite of our modern period of educational reform is still aloft but its descent has already begun.

Beginning of Modern Reform Movement

The current period of educational reform for minorities began for all practical purposes in 1954. On May 17, 1954 the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its historic decision that public school segregation laws are unconstitutional because they violate the Fourteenth Amendment, which guarantees equal protection for all American citizens.[2] In delivering the Court's decision, Chief Justice Earl Warren said:

> We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal . . . Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local government.[3]

This historic decision was the beginning of the fulfillment of a promise to black, brown, yellow, red and many white Americans. But, at best, it was only a beginning. In the few years after the *Brown* decision was rendered, the United States experienced the birth of two major social reform movements: the Civil Rights Movement and the War on Poverty. It was inevitable that one of the results of these social reform movements would be the birth of a new educational reform movement, for the American people have historically viewed their public schools as necessary agents of social change, as well as an institution for developing good citizens. Note the following excerpt from Chief Justice Warren's opinion in *Brown v. Board of Education:*

> (Education) is the very foundation of good citizenship.

> Today it is the principal instrument in awakening the child's cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training and in helping him adjust normally to his environment . . .[4]

Those words were a remarkable harbinger of the premises on which the current educational reform movement would be constructed.

Almost eleven years after the U.S. Supreme Court struck down segregated school systems as unconstitutional, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) was signed into law.[5] Title I of this Act represented the largest amount of federal aid ever to be allocated to elementary and secondary education; it was also the first educational program to concentrate exclusively on the needs of poor children.[6] President Lyndon Johnson remarked at a reception marking the enactment of the legislation

> Congress has passed the most significant educational bill in the history of the Congress. We have made a new commitment to equality and to equality in education of our young people.[7]

On March 3, 1970, slightly less than five years after the signing of ESEA, President Richard M. Nixon released the following message of educational reform.

> American education is in urgent need of reform . . . We must stop thinking of primary and secondary education as the school system alone—when we now have reason to believe that young people may be learning much more *outside* school than they learn in school . . . We must stop letting wishes color our judgements about the educational effectiveness of many special compensatory programs, when—despite some dramatic and encouraging exceptions—there is growing evidence that most of them are not yet measurably improving the success of poor children in school . . . Recent findings of the two largest such programs are particularly disturbing. We now spend more than $1 billion a year for educational programs under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act. Most of these have stressed the teaching of reading, but before-and-after tests suggest that only 19% of the children in such programs improve their reading significantly; 13% appear to fall behind more than expected; that is, they continue to fall behind. In our Head Start programs, where so much hope is invested, we find that youngsters enrolled only for the summer achieve almost no gains, and the gains of those in the program for a full year are soon matched by their

non-Head Start classmates from similarly poor backgrounds.[8]

This message dealt a serious blow to the current educational reform movement which had been born less than 16 years earlier.[9] Obviously, the current educational reform movement is not totally dead, but much of its life fluid, in the form of federal monies, has been extracted, thus seriously depleting its vigor and effectiveness.

Scope of Paper

The chronology of events listed above is not intended to represent a complete history of modern educational reform nor is it intended to indicate the entire scope of the movement. Such a task would be awesome in both length and breadth. Instead, this paper will focus on minorities and educational reform by examining the two best known federal educational reform efforts—Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act and the Head Start Program. The paper will (1) provide a brief overview of the Elementary and Secondary Administration Act; (2) describe the purpose of Title I including the criteria for allocating funds; (3) discuss the political and administrative problems involved in the implementing of Title I; (4) discuss the evaluation process of Title I and its shortcomings; (5) provide an overview of Head Start; (6) provide reports that cite conflicting evidence as to the effectiveness of Head Start programs; (7) and finally, share with you the author's thoughts on minorities and educational reform.

I have chosen to discuss the federal education reform efforts because it is my belief that federal involvement in the modern educational reform is what distinguishes it from the two prior movements of the nineteenth century and the Progressive Era. Federal involvement offered great hope that this most recent movement would be successful in achieving its goals. Yet, as should become evident as this paper proceeds, federal involvement in modern educational reform and its concomitant expenditure of millions of dollars could not insure success for minorities who were educationally disadvantaged when success is measured by the achievement of certain goals and those goals are either unclear or disputed. If one is discussing education, ideally one would want to know if a particular program has made any educational changes in the lives of those students at whom the program is aimed. However, this assumes that there is agreement among all involved as to what constitutes improved education. Disagreement over the goals of Title I and Head Start, and the attempts at evaluating the success of both programs in achieving those disputed goals have been some of the major problems plaguing both programs. To make what I am discussing a bit more clear, try to answer for yourself the following two questions:

> Are improved reading scores more or less important than or as important as some signs of increased ethnic pride? And if reading scores go down but ethnic pride goes up, how does one add those two outcomes into some meaningful score to compare with a situation where reading scores improved but ethnic pride decreased?[10]

Obviously, these two factors which are among the many which might be used in establishing goals for an educational program are open to all sorts of conflicting interpretations when value judgements are made. It should be easy to see that the more factors which are involved, the more conflicting interpretations arise, and the more difficult it is to arrive at a mutually agreeable goal.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act: A Brief Review

The Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) of 1965 is a landmark piece of educational legislation. It represents the largest single commitment by the Federal government to strengthen and improve educational quality and opportunities in elementary and secondary schools across the nation. The Act, however, has sometimes been called a child of compromise. Compromises had to be worked out concerning urban/rural, church/state, and civil rights issues before it could receive the approval of Congress. Many persons believed that the first priority of the Act was to produce federal aid legislation, and only secondly to begin the reform of the educational system. The accuracy of that statement is born out in the result obtained in a national survey conducted on school administrators in May of 1966. The survey revealed that approximately 70 percent of the administrators believed that Title I funds should not be allocated on the basis of poverty.[11]

Jerome Murphy also supported this thesis that many educators felt that Title I funds were to be used to support current educational activities with the following statement:

> As far as the educational associations in Washington were concerned, their primary interest was general support for on-going public school activities. Although they accepted the poverty theme as a necessary compromise to achieve aid for the public school system, their emphasis was on breaking barriers to federal aid, on the grounds that this would be a major step toward general support at a later date. Furthermore, they were reluctant to oppose a strong President at the height of his political power.[12]

A unique feature of the Act is that it was the first time that federal educational legislation included an evaluation requirement within

the law itself. The avowed purpose of this requirement was to encourage schools to strive for greater success, and not to allow Title I monies to be used meaninglessly.

The first five titles of ESEA are designed (1) to meet special needs of educationally deprived children; (2) to provide school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for the use of children and teachers; (3) to encourage innovative and exemplary educational practices through the support of supplementary centers and services; (4) to extend educational research, and development; and (5) to strengthen State Departments of Education. The central theme common to the diverse elements of the Elementary and Secondary Act is that of reform. Never before has such a concerted effort in education been so designed as to "stimulate innovations to strengthen the states, to link research with the school, and to make the problems of the poor the nation's number one educational priority."[13]

One hundred years after the Civil War, the government of the United States finally decided to provide extensive funding to elementary and secondary schools in an attempt to equalize educational opportunity for minorities. The result of this decision was the enactment of ESEA. Unfortunately, not everyone agreed as to what exactly the objectives of Title I were. The notion underlying the Act was familiar and very American: Give poor children the opportunity to do well in school and they will do well as adults.[14] Even today, however, it is clear only that there is a great confusion about what has been or should have been accomplished under Title I.

Title I is the heart of the ESEA. It has the largest financial resources and two basic purposes.

1. ". . . to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families . . ."
2. ". . . to expand and improve these educational programs by various means which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children."[15]

To accomplish this purpose Title I provides $1 billion yearly in grants to public educational agencies to meet the special educational needs of disadvantaged children in low-income areas, children in institutes for the handicapped, neglected or delinquent, children of migratory agricultural workers and American Indian children attending Federal schools. Programs are directed at helping children whose educational achievement is below the norm, including those with physical, mental or emotional handicaps. Such projects as supplementary and remedial instruction, pupil and family counseling, cultural enrichment, or health and welfare services needed to

overcome learning handicaps may be included in such programs.[16]

Funding

Allocation of funds to school districts is based on the number of 5- to 17-year-old children from low-income families residing in the school district, in foster homes, or in institutions for the neglected or delinquent, multiplied by one-half the State average per pupil expenditure. Low-income families are those who earn less than $2000 annually and those who receive more than $2000 under the Social Security Act's aid to families with dependent children.

The basic formula that is used for determining the funds a school district receives may be expressed by the following equation:

$$.50P(I + D + N) = E$$

Where: P = Per Pupil Expenditure in the State
I = Number of Children in Families with less than $2000 income
D = Number of Children in Families receiving Aid to Dependent Children with Incomes in excess of $2000
N = Number of Neglected or Delinquent Children in Institutions
E = Maximum Entitlement of a Local School District[17]

Administration

The U.S. Commissioner of Education has the task of implementing the Title I Program. It is the responsibility of the Office of Education to make periodic audits of state and local expenditures to ascertain if the laws and regulations are being followed. This is an awesome task for an agency that has had "no experience with grants in aid of the size and scope of Title I nor had it ever been called upon to write 'basic criteria' governing the approval of projects."[18] Furthermore, in the first few years of its existence there was an air of urgency surrounding the implementation of Title I. Programs were hastily and poorly implemented by the school districts and the Office of Education purposely overlooked programmatic shortcomings in order to avoid charges of federal control.

Ineffective administration continued until the publication of the report *Title I of ESEA: Is It Helping Poor Children?* This report, published by the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., authored by Ruby Martin and Phyllis McClure cites flagrant violations in the administration and implementation of Title I. The report states that, "Millions of dollars appropriated by Congress to help educationally deprived children have been wasted, diverted or otherwise misused by States and local authorities."[19]

The following problems in the administration of Title I are summarized by the authors.

1. The intended beneficiaries of Title I—poor children—are being denied the benefits of the Act because of improper and illegal use of Title I funds.
2. Many Title I programs are poorly planned and executed so that the needs of educationally deprived children are not met. In some instances there are no Title I programs to meet the needs of these children.
3. State departments of education, which have major responsibility for operating the program and approving Title I project applications, have not lived up to their legal responsibility to administer the program in conformity with the law and the intent of Congress.
4. The United States Office of Education, which has overall responsibility for administering the Act, is reluctant and timid in its administration of Title I and abdicates to the States its responsibility for enforcing the law.
5. Poor people and representatives of community organizations are excluded from the planning and design of Title I. Eligible children know nothing about Title I. In some communities, school officials refuse to provide information about the Title I program to local residents.[20]

The report did have an impact on correcting some of the many weaknesses of the Title I program. More staff monitors were added to the Title I staff. The real impact of the report however, was that of increasing the number of parents of poor children and representatives of community organizations involved in planning, designing and implementing Title I programs. Parent advisory councils are specifically mandated by federal regulations. Although those councils are accorded only an advisory role, they nevertheless have used this advisor role to have a greater influence over programs, expenditures and personnel. "Where parents are involved in making real decisions about the operation of Title I, parents and educators agree that there is improvement in children's achievement and motivation."[21] However, in spite of the report and the demand by supporting critics for more effective administration, the administration of Title I still continued to be basically ineffective.

Another report published in 1971 by the NAACP Legal Defense Fund entitled *An Even Chance* also points out how ineffective programs were administered. This report on Federal funds for Indian Children in public school districts stated in its conclusion:

> The facts exposed in this report have a historic reality to Indian people. The physical and psychological mistreatment of Indian children, the suppression of Indian history, culture and language, the unfulfilled promises of federal legislation, and the discrimination in the allocation of resources—all these are a foundation and routine part of the lives of Indian parents and students . . .[22]

Although the NAACP reports were issued in 1969 and 1971 respectively, a more recent statement (November, 1972) appearing in *Title I Litigation Materials*, prepared by the Center for Law and Education at Harvard University, reported similar findings:

> There is mounting evidence that local and state educational agencies are approving projects which are unrelated to the needs of poor children, ignoring instances on noncompliance with guidelines and regulations, failing to conduct periodic audits which are necessary to monitor Title I expenditures, and keeping inadequate records of their activities; and that the Commissioner of Education has not pressed the States for compliance or employed the ultimate sanction of cutting off funds to states that do not comply substantially with the Act and regulations.[23]

Criticism of the administration of Title I does not, however, come only from external sources. In a recent report published by the U.S. Office of Education *The Effectiveness of Compensatory Education: Summary and Review of the Evidence*, the following statement was made ". . . More than resources are necessary for a good compensatory education program; careful innovative planning and effective management are also essential."[24]

According to Jerome Murphy the reasons cited above for the ineffectiveness of Title I were only a part of the problem. Murphy believes that politics were the major cause of Title I's failure.

> Why has Title I been administered this way? To blame the problems of timidity, incompetency, or 'selling out' is to beg the question. I have identified a number of contributing causes: the reformers were not the implementers; inadequate staff; a disinclination to monitor; a law and tradition favoring local control; and absence of pressure from the poor. The primary cause, however, is political. The federal system—with its dispersion of power and control—not only permits but encourages the evasion and dilution of federal reform, making it nearly impossible for the federal administrators to impose program priorities; those not diluted by Congressional intervention, can be ignored during state and local implementation.[25]

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, established by Congress to monitor Title I programs, has also offered several critical suggestions in their annual evaluation report. In the report for 1969 the Council offered recommendations in the following areas.

Level of Funding

> . . . the Council is distressed at what appears to be a weakening federal commitment to the education of disadvantaged children . . . The Council therefore, recommends that the Executive and Legislative branches move as quickly as possible to close the gap between the Title I appropriations and authorizations of the $2.7 billion.

Coordinating of Effort

> . . . Because of the damage done Title I by annual uncertainty among school officials, we recommend consideration of long-term legislative authority so that educators can plan for the unremitting effort that Title I must receive if it is to fully succeed . . .

Quality Control and State Control

> . . . USOE should work with the State Departments of Education to improve the monitoring of programs and ensure, but withholding funds if necessary that the basic criteria are being followed at the local levels . . .

Diffusion of Control

> . . . concentrating funds where the need is the greatest so that a limited number of dollars can have genuine impact rather than being dissipated in laudable but inconclusive efforts . . .[26]

Discouraged by the tendency of some school officials to view Title I as an alternative to school desegregation, the Council also made the following recommendations:

> That federal, state and local officials exercise their responsibility to prevent Title I from being used as a negative incentive—one that prolongs segregation—by ensuring that disadvantaged children retain their Title I benefits when transferred to schools whose student population consist of socio-economically advantaged children.[27]

The Council, in appraising Congress of the failures and inadequacies of the Act, suggested solving the problems of compensatory education successfully required an integration of many resources and techniques.

> It has long been clear that the mere addition of people,

> equipment, and special services does not by itself constitute compensatory education; success in making up for the educational deprivation which stems from poverty requires a strategy for blending these resources in an integrated program that strikes at both roots and consequences of disadvantage.[28]

The majority of the critics of the Title I program were critical not because they were against the program or because they didn't think it would eventually succeed, but were instead offering suggestions to improve its effectiveness as in the first NAACP report.

> . . . This report is intended as a defense of Title I. Our criticisms are offered in order to make its operation more effective and to ensure that the Congressional intent is implemented. We believe that Federal aid to education is now firmly embedded in our system and should be encouraged, not weakened. However, we feel obliged to report to poor people, to minority people, to the President, to Congress and to the Nation what we have learned about Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965. We hope by bringing into light some of the more flagrant misuses of Title I funds that a concerted and continuing effort will ensure to help poor children get what the Nation promised them when the Act was passed.[29]

It would seem that with all of the constructive criticism, that Title I would be successful: that administration and politics would band together in hopes of furthering the concept of equality of education. Unfortunately, this has not been the case.

Evaluation

The aspect of Title I that has kept the movement for modern educational reform from really getting off the ground is the evaluation phase. Congressional law stated that in order for a local educational project to be approved

> . . . Effective procedures, including provisions for appropriate objective measurements of education achievement will be adopted for evaluation at least annually of the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.[30]

The shortsightedness of this aspect of the law was not in demanding an evaluation process, but in considering educational achievement as the sole criteria for success. Those in charge of the evaluation of Title I used student achievement as the single criterion for program success. The assessment of this criterion being measured by culturally biased standardized instruments. The National Advisory

Council which had the responsibility of monitoring the congressional law, listed the criterion for rating a program as either successful or unsuccessful as having to be based on the following:

> Only compensatory programs whose directors had measured achievement through standardized tests . . . the achievement gain had to exceed that made by a control group . . . pupils had to gain in language or number skills . . .[31]

Thus, fraught with its many administrative shortcomings and political compromises, the Elementary and Secondary Act further decreased its chance for success by using within a program that was designed for the so-called educationally and culturally disadvantaged student the same criterion and instrument that is used to measure middle class white students. The Council, aware of this shortcoming and trying to build a case for the inclusion of other variables in assessing program effectiveness stated:

> Professional educators and social scientists should intensify their review of achievement tests currently in use so as to further reduce any components which might be biased against the child of disadvantaged background and hence conceal indications of true, latent ability. We further urge these professionals to move beyond cognitive achievement tests and into other realms—self-concept, creativity, motivation, behavior—where compensatory education programs may have equally important long-range results.[32]

Although there are individuals working in these areas recommended by the Council, this improvement has not yet truly begun.

Project Head Start

Project Head Start began in the summer of 1965. The Office of Economic Opportunity, through which the program was funded, hoped to improve the opportunity and development of the children of the poor. The main focus was on the child himself: improving his physical health, his social and emotional development, his relationships with his family and theirs to him, his sense of worth as a person, and his cognitive and linguistic skills.[33]

Each local Head Start program must include the following components: health, nutrition, education, psychology, and social services, parent involvement and volunteer participation.

Success or Failure—Conflicting Reports

Whether the Head Start program is having a positive effect on the economically deprived youngster depends upon the literature

that one reads. E. Omwake, in an early study of Head Start programs, observed that Head Start programs had given children a positive attitude toward school. Head Start children starting the first grade seemed better prepared for school than their older brothers and sisters had seemed when they began school.[34] E. Zigler reported in 1967 that after two summers of Head Start, there were optimistic reports that because of the Head Start program children had shown a more positive self-concept and were happier.[35] A 1968 research summary of Project Head Start in *Integrated Education* reported that the results of studies or primary summer Head Start children indicated that the program is making a promising first step toward raising the achievement level of deprived children.[36]

One study that caused a great deal of national controversy about the impact of Head Start was conducted by the Westinghouse Lansing Corporation and Ohio University. The eleven month (June 1968-May 1969) study was conducted to determine whether Head Start programs have had a psychological and intellectual impact on primary age children continuing into the primary grades.[37]

The Westinghouse study analyzed data on 1,980 children from 104 Head Start Centers and 1,983 non-Head Start children selected from the same geographic areas as the centers. The Head Start children and the non-Head Start children were in the same grade—first, second and third. Both groups were tested for cognitive and affective development. Six instruments were used: The Metropolitan Readiness Tests, Stanford Achievement Tests, Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, Children's Self-Concept Index, Classroom Behavior Inventory, and Children's Attitude Range Indicator.

Parents of Head Start children and non-Head Start children, directors, and other officials of the programs were interviewed. Primary grade teachers were instructed to rate both groups of children in achievement motivation and to describe the intellectual and emotional environment of their schools.

The report concluded that the Head Start program was not successful. Specifically the report states that the summer programs do not produce gains that persist into the early elementary grades. Full-year programs are ineffective as measured by the tests of affective development but "marginally" effective in producing gains in cognitive development. Programs appeared to be more effective for certain sub-groups of Head Start centers: Negro centers, central cities, and Southeastern centers; however, Head Start children were still below national norms for standardized tests of language development and scholastic achievement though near the norms on school readiness at the first grade. Parents of Head Start enrollees voiced strong approval of the program and reported substantial participation in the activities of the centers.[38], [39]

The report's findings were quickly disputed and the study at-

tacked by a number of the members of the educational community. Robert Finch, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, criticized the preliminary report stating that "I challenge the basis for the report, it was not broad enough." The study "contained insufficient facts and the data was sloppy."[40] Dr. William Madow, a statistical consultant to the study withdrew his name from the study stating, "Far from accepting payment for my work, I would appreciate your removing my name as a statistical consultant, since I would not want anyone to think that I had any responsibility for the design and the analysis and conclusions based on, it seems to me to be inaccuracies."[41]

The controversy centered around (1) the procedure used by Westinghouse-Ohio to select and procure their sample of Head Start and non-Head Start children and (2) the analysis of the data from the Metropolitan Readiness test.

Marshall S. Smith and Joan S. Bissel conducted a re-analysis of the Westinghouse-Ohio data and offered the following observations concerning the sample procedures.

> The sample of Head Start centers is almost certainly unrepresentative of the national population of centers. Little evidence is presented in the Report to suggest that biases which might have occurred in the selection procedures did not seriously affect the results of the survey. Further, in the one 'overall' sample that we analyzed—the full-year first-grade sample—the intercorrelations among socio-economic and school readiness variables were very different for the Head Start and control samples.[42]

Smith and Bissel in discussing the Head Start students and the control student's performance on the Metropolitan Readiness Test state:

> In a re-analysis of the effect of full-year Head Start on the overall sample of first-grade children, we found, unlike the Report, that the Head Start group scored higher than the control group on the Metropolitan Readiness Test by a large enough margin for us to consider the differences 'educationally significant.' Although our analysis differed slightly from that used by Westinghouse-Ohio, our conclusions differed primarily because we focused on the distribution of individual readiness scores while Westinghouse-Ohio focused on average group performance. By using the Metropolitan Readiness Test guidelines for evaluating individual children, we found that 9% of the children who attended Head Start would be classified in an 'average or above average readiness' group while they

would be classified in the 'below average' readiness groups without the Head Start experience.[43]

Another reason for the report causing such great controversy was because the study only measured cognitive and affective goals, whereas in the guidelines for Head Start programs the major focus was on the total child, health (social and emotional), as well as cognitive growth were to be considered.

There was also encouragement for program variation—with different centers emphasizing different techniques to reach this goal. The importance of program variation was demonstrated in 1969 when a major experimental program called Planned Variation, was funded and coordinated by the Office of Child Development, was initiated within the framework of Head Start's education component.[44] Planned Program Variation recognized that "too often we succumb to an assumption that the child and the school situation are identical and superimpose a predesigned program on the children because it reports significant test results."[45]

Although many elements, (i.e., health) that are an integral part of the Head Start program were not used by the Westinghouse evaluation team to assess the Head Start program, President Nixon said that in view of the report's findings he would treat Head Start as an experimental rather than an operational program.[46] Thus, a study that was denounced by the Secretary of HEW and severely criticized by one of its statistical consultants, that neglected to include within its research design other important elements of Head Start programs, i.e., health, was being spiritedly debated by members of the educational community and was used as the determining factor to cause the Head Start program to continue to be an educational experiment and not a fundamental part of the public school.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Federal involvement in any project involves a certain degree of political compromise in a democratic society such as ours. The members of Congress, who control the purse strings of the United States, usually listen to comments and criticism of specific legislative programs from all sides. In making a decision about whether or not to amend a piece of legislation or how to vote on a bill, many members of Congress weigh not only their own conscience but also their feelings about the political sagacity of a particular vote, based on the support (or lack of support) that particular bill may have. Melvin M. Tumin has made an astute assessment of what federal intervention in the domestic affairs of the United States must entail:

> . . . if the federal government is going to intervene in the domestic affairs of the society, it simply must seek the widest possible support; it must provide for the widest

> possible participation; it must allow diverse political elements to find grounds for support of the program; it must make provision for flexibility and volatility so that directions can be changed, if need be, in midstream; it must scatter its targets so that at least some of them can be accomplished, to some degree; it must be sufficiently ambiguous to permit different interpretations as various actors involved in the Program try to integrate the "innovations" with their own established practices. Finally, it must be wildly overacclaimed in the rhetoric of the Great Society, or it cannot triumph over parochial objectives based on partisan interests.[47]

Later in his discussion of this subject Tumin hits upon the paramount difficulty involved in establishing any program within the scope he has outlined: "Namely, no sound evaluation of such programs is possible."[48] In examining Title I and Head Start it becomes quite clear, however, that while the federal government could not reconcile the differences between a program of wide reaching educational reform and the requirement that such a program must demonstrate "success" on some arbitrary scale. The federal government attempted to ignore this reality and incorporate both of these elements in Title I and Head Start.

The result of this blithe policy of ignoring certain sociological realities was a series of "compensatory" educational programs. Use of the word compensatory tended to imply that different cultures are inferior and must be brought up to a higher standard if minority children from these cultures are to succeed.[49]

The compensatory model neglected the child's own milieu. Baratz and Baratz, in their article "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism," suggested that intervention programs such as Head Start will not succeed unless there is recognition and utilization of the existing cultural forms of the lower-class black community to teach new skills. They also maintain that programs do not recognize and utilize the existing culture forms of minorities to construct a form of instructional racism. The authors present an illustration of a pathological versus cultural interpretation when they contrast the interventionists' statement that describes Negro children as verbally destitute and linguistically underdeveloped with current data that indicates that Negro children speak a highly developed but a different style of English from the standard. They state:

> The childhood programs, as well as public schools, fail in the long run because they define educability in terms of a child's ability to perform within an alien culture; yet they make no attempt to teach him systematically new cultural

patterns so that the initial spurt in test scores can be maintained. Educability, for culturally different children must not be misevaluated as evidence of 'intelligence,' but rather should be viewed as evidence of the degree to which the child is familiar with the mainstream system upon which the tests are based both in content and presentation.[50]

They conclude:

> . . . the social pathology model has led social science to establish programs to prevent deficits which are simply not there. The failure of intervention reflects the ethnocentrism of methodologies and theories which do not give credence to the cognitive and intellectual skills of the child. A research program on the same scale as that mounted to support the social pathology model must be launched in order to discover the different, but not pathological, forms of Negro behavior. Then and only then can programs be created that utilize the child's differences as a means of furthering his acculturation to the mainstream while maintaining his individual identity and cultural heritage.[51]

Federal programs for educational reform were an honest attempt to cope with problems in our society which are under-utilizing human potential. Unfortunately, however, they have tended to rest on a limited and inflexible knowledge base, which makes them extremely vulnerable to attack.

Education had traditionally been viewed in the United States as a tool to reduce inequality in American society. Today, however, this assumption is under heavy challenge. The narrow basis used for evaluating federal educational intervention programs has provided some ammunition to the opposition. The Colemen Report, which also evaluates student "success" or "failure" solely on the basis of academic achievement has provided even more ammunition to those who would seek to eliminate federal involvement in educational reform. The following excerpt from an article in the March, 1973 issue of the *Atlantic Monthly makes this very clear:*

> The post-Coleman challenge to the case for spending money on education is beginning to echo through the halls of Congress, ominously for the supporters of federal aid to education, who include both Representative John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana, the chairman of the House Select Subcommittee on Education, and one of his Republican colleagues, Representative Albert Quie of Minnesota. In a recent speech Quie has made it plain that he remains to be convinced that compensatory education makes no difference. John Brademas is afraid that the social science findings, misunderstood or deliberately

misrepresented, will be used to justify savage cuts in federal aid to elementary and secondary education and to make opposition to such programs respectable. He is deeply skeptical of the case against the efficacy of educational spending, pointing out not only that federal aid still amounts to only 7 percent of the cost of elementary and secondary schooling but also that in many cases funds intended under Title I for compensatory education for underprivileged children have been indiscriminately spent for political reasons on middle class children, so that few valid conclusions can be drawn from the experience of Title I. He feels adrift without adequate information, while the opponents of educational spending are able to use the social scientists' evidence, often disingeniously.[52]

The problem of the failure of our educational system to meet the needs of minority people has neither disappeared nor been eradicated. However, if the present trend continues, the problem may soon be simply ignored. Federal intervention programs are not inherently bad. It is the infusion of the melting pot theory and its concomitant subtle—yet nonetheless very real—racism which have made these programs appear to be failures. As concerned educators and/or members of minority groups, it is our obligation to meet head on this issue of what constitutes success or failure in our federal educational intervention programs. We must explore the use of other evaluation techniques and make a convincing case for our belief that academic achievement should not and must not be the sole basis for determining the effectiveness of any educational project. Only by doing this will we be able to keep aloft the kite of our present educational reform movement. If we are not persistent and vocal the winds of change which keep our kite aloft may die down, or someone may decide to pull in the kite's string and use it for some other purpose.

[1] Michael B. Katz, "The Present Movement in Educational Reform," *Harvard Educational Review*, 41 (August, 1971).

[2] *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, et. al.*, 347 U.S. 482 (1954).

[3] *Ibid.*, at 495.

[4] *Ibid.*, at 492.

[5] Funds were made available to local school systems on September 23, 1965 after the 1965-66 school year had already begun.

[6] Prepared by the Division of Legal Information and Community Service, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., *Title I In Your Community*. (New York, New York, August 1972), p. i.

[7] Public Papers of the Presidents, *Remarks to Members of Congress at a Reception Marking the Enactment of the Education Bill*, April 13, 1965.

[8] Public Papers of the Presidents, *Special Message to the Congress on Educational Reform*, March 3, 1970.

[9] Sixteen years may seem a very long time, but not when it is the adoption of a new education innovation, which may take over 50 years from the inception to the adoption of an innovation. Actually, it was approximately five years from September 1965, when schools started receiving funds to the President's message of March.

[10] Melvin Tumin (Forward) to Ronald G. Corwin, *Reform and Organizational Survival The Teacher Corps As An Instrument of Educational Change* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973).

[11] Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher, ESEA: *The Office Of Education Administers a Law.* (Syracuse University Press, 1968), p. 306.

[12] *Ibid.*, 9.

[13] Jerome T. Murphy, "Title I of ESEA: The Politics of Implementing Federal Education Reform," *Harvard Educational Review*, 40 (February, 1971), 36.

[14] Murphy, "Inequality in Education," *Op. Cit.*, p. 9.

[15] *Education of the Disadvantaged*, An Evaluative Report on Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Fiscal Year 1968, (USOE, 1970), p. 3.

[16] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Profile of ESEA* (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 3.

[17] Center for Law and Education at Harvard University, *Title I Litigation Materials*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1972), p. 14.

[18] Murphy, "Inequality in Education," *Op. Cit.*, p. 10.

[19] Ruby Martin and Phyllis McClure, *Title I Of ESEA: Is It Helping Poor Children?* Report by the Washington Research Project of the Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy and NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (1969), p. ii.

[20] *Ibid.*, ii-iii.

[21] Phyllis McClure, "School Spending Reformed by Parent Power," *South Today* IV #10 (August, 1973).

[22] NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., *An Even Chance* (New York, New York, 1971) p. 59.

[23] *Title I Litigation Materials, Op. Cit.*, p. 7.

[24] *The Effectiveness of Compensatory Education: Summary and Review of the Evidence* (Department of Health, Education and Welfare), p. 5.

[25] Murphy, "Title I of ESEA: The Politics of Implementing Federal Education Reform," *Op. Cit.*, p. 60.

[26] The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, *Title I—ESEA: A Review and a Forward Look*, (Washington, D.C., 1969) pp. 10-18.

[27] *Ibid.*, 10-18.

[28] *Ibid.*, 3.

[29] Martin, *Title I of ESEA: Is it Helping Poor Children, Op. Cit.*, p. vi.

[30] Kathryn A. Hecht, "Title I Federal Evaluation: The First Five Years," *Teachers College Record*, (September, 1973) p. 68.

[31] Hecht, "Title I Federal Evaluation," *Op. Cit.*, p. 68.

[32] *Ibid.*, 26.

[33] Lois-Ellen Dattz "Head Start's Influence on Community Change," *Children*, 17 (1970), 193.

[34] E. Omwake, "Has Head Start Made a Difference?" *Childhood Education*, 42 (1966) 479.

[35] E. Zigler, "Project Headstart—the Record After Two Years," *United States News and World Report*, 62 (1967) 72-74.

[36] "Project Head Start: A Research Summary," *Integrated Education*, VI #5 (1968) 45-54.

[37] The author pointed out that the study did not examine the program's medical or nutritional aspects or the impact of family life, on the community, on the schools, or the morale and the attitudes of the children in the program.

[38] Victor G. Cirirelli *et al.*, *The Impact of Head Start: An Evaluation of the Effects of Head Start on Children's Cognitive and Affective Development*, the report of a study undertaken by Westinghouse Learning Corps and Ohio University under con-

tract B89-4536 dated June 20, 1968, with the Office of Economic Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, June, 1968). The Preliminary Report was issued in April 1969.

[39] John M. Kean, "The Impact of Head Start: An Evaluation of the Effects of Headstart in Children's Cognitive and Affective Development," *Childhood Education*, 46 (May, 1970) p.

[40] Dateline Washington, D.C., *New York Times* (April 24, 1969).

[41] Dateline Washington, D.C., *New York Times*, (April 17, 1969).

[42] Marshall S. Smith and Joan S. Bissell, "Report Analysis: The Impact of Head Start," *Harvard Educational Review*, 40 #1 (February, 1970), 101.

[43] *Ibid.*, 101.

[44] Jenny W. Klein, "Planned Variation in Head Start Programs," *Children*, 18 (January-February, 1971) p. 8.

[45] Christine F. Branche, "Children Fit No Model: Program Considerations for Early Childhood Education in Urban Areas."

[46] Dateline Washington, D.C., *New York Times*, (April 26, 1969).

[47] Melvin Tumin (Forward) to Ronald G. Corwin, *Reform and Organizational Survival The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973) p. x.

[48] *Ibid.*, x.

[49] Edmond W. Gordon and Doxey A. Wilkerson, *Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged: Programs and Practices: Pre-School Through College* (College Entrance Examination Board, 1966).

[50] Stephen S. Baratz and Joan C. Baratz, "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism," *Harvard Educational Review*, 40 (February, 1970) 42.

[51] *Ibid.*, 47.

[52] Godfrey Hodgson, "Do Schools Make a Difference?" *Atlantic Monthly* (March, 1973) p. 45.

S5

5

Teacher Education as an Instrumentality for Change

by Martin Haberman

The occupational disease which binds professors of education into a collective resembling a professional group has several symptoms. First, we share the delusion of having relevant knowledge; that we know how to teach the various types of children and youth who inhabit the schools and that we could in fact demonstrate this know-how; were it not for the fact that we have been summoned to the higher calling of professordom. Second, it is our delusion of omniscience; that in a year or two under our tutelage we can reverse the fourteen years of enculturation which preservice students have assimilated through their previous life school experiences. Third, is our delusion of authenticity; that because state department bureaucrats and university administrators support our certification powers, these powers represent a genuine ability to discern the passage of neophytes into professionals and not merely a Disney-land credentialing process. Fourth, is the delusion of significance; that what we do in teacher education actually affects public schools' curricula in important ways. And fifth, the delusion of power; that given some objectives or missions we have the ability to change what happens in schools and colleges. Although there is little data to support these myths they do serve the useful functions of keeping us active and involved. They also keep our self-concepts and expectations high so that we might someday realize a breakthrough in one of these five areas as a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy. In any event, the purpose of this paper is to deal with only one of our symptoms; the belief that we can change teacher education and the public schools in important ways. While the vehicle for our analysis is the Teacher Corps, other movements in teacher education (e.g., intern programs, NDEA institutes, Headstart leadership training programs, etc.), would all serve equally well.

Background Assumptions of the Drafters

The early 1960's were a period of great expectations for those seeking to attack what they perceived to be neglected social problems. For the first time in history the federal machinery was directly focused on making the American dream of equal opportunity a reality. Legislation, however, was not drafted by cautious social scientists or by business administrators wary of trying to work magic on organized bureaucracies; it was drafted by passionate, true believers and then watered down for passage by sympathetic, liberal senators. As a result, many of the ideas which became programs were characterized by noble intentions but monumentally naive assumptions about the way complex educational institutions can be influenced to change. While some experts who testified were passionate about how individuals could change

the world, there were others—even in 1965—who were already well aware of the immense difficulties involved in changing the social systems of universities and schools. They tried to advise the senators to view the Teacher Corps as an organizational change strategy and not simply as a way to recruit enthusiastic individuals. One consultant actually made five recommendations which hindsight now reveals might have made Teacher Corps a force for change and not merely a collective of individuals with fragmented hopes and dreams. He advised:

1. *Public school-university cooperation.* The preparation of effective teachers cannot be accomplished by either the universities or the public schools acting independently. Representatives of both institutions in a given locale should establish a *cooperative council* which would be required to make a *joint* proposal for a grant to the United States Office of Education.

2. *Future Dissemination.* A commitment for the future support and expansion of the program, if it is to be evaluated as successful, should be a condition for awarding grants to *councils* representing a particular school system and university.

3. *Freedom to Introduce Innovations.* Members of the National Teacher Corps cannot be restricted by the present curriculum materials used in public schools. Their freedom to experiment with new approaches in teaching the disadvantaged must be safeguarded.

4. *Concentration of New Personnel.* Interns cannot be dispersed to all districts which need them. As individuals or in small teams they will be ineffective in introducing important innovations. In order to experiment with this means of effecting change in schools and universities, interns must be concentrated in selected districts.

5. *Independent Evaluation.* It is most important that neither the public schools, the universities, nor the United States Office of Education evaluate a program which they have been responsible for instituting. Individuals selected from various universities and school systems not involved in the program should establish criteria for evaluating and serve as an evaluation panel.[1]

The main thrust of teacher education's change energies at this time was directed at showing that internships were better than traditional student teaching programs. We were so eager to use every opportunity to expand our knowledge and commitment to the internship approach that some of the experts led the framers of the legislation to overgeneralize. Subsequent experience has shown that what worked for the University of Wisconsin-Madison teams placed in school systems such as Appleton, and Wauwatosa, Wisconsin did not transfer to the rural south or to the great cities.

Similarly, the fit-in persons who proved successful in the urban internships offered by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee in the Milwaukee Public Schools were not the kinds of trainees subsequently recruited on a national basis. The program patterns developed so successfully in Madison and Milwaukee and upon which the initial bill patterned the original version of the Teacher Corps, had demonstrated that the intern approach is a better way to prepare teachers than the student teaching approach. It did *not* prove that the intern pattern could be offered by universities and colleges of any quality, or that any kind of school district could work with interns, or that the Teacher Corps would attract graduate students such as those attending the University of Wisconsin in the early 1960's; and most crucial, the Wisconsin success with interns did *not* prove that they would be change agents who could successfully alter either college programs or public school curricula. In short, the whole experience was a classic case of overgeneralization. The intern faculty had clearly developed a better way to prepare teachers but had then permitted their enthusiasm to go beyond their data and experience. Finally, neither the educational experts who were consulted, nor the senators took sufficient cognizance of the fact that between the youngsters they were all bleeding for and the noble Corpsmen who would rescue them, stood a series of the most formidable maintenance organizations in America: the university, the public schools, the state certification machinery, the teachers' associations and unions, and the federal bureaucracy, all supported by the values of the public at large. Their honest but simple-minded assumption that inexperienced Corpsmen could be a significant force in the education of disadvantaged youngsters, without first effecting change in these several intervening organizations, was like a prenatal cancer emplanted in the bill itself.

> The National Teacher Corps bill seeks to do these two things: (1) enable districts to recruit the best teachers to work with children who need the most help—typically, the best teachers work with children who need less help; and (2) provide the necessary funds and motivation for attracting bright young people to devote the creative talent and energy to our most cutting national concern.[2]

Reform and Organizational Survival

In his analysis of the Teacher Corps experience as one example of using teacher education as a change strategy, Ronald Corwin's work serves three useful functions: it offers process data gathered from instruments which can be useful in future evaluations of programs; it outlines a series of sound theoretical concepts for

understanding the nature of any organizational change; it draws conclusions and makes recommendations about the Teacher Corps which will undoubtedly provide guidance to future teacher educators working toward similar institutional changes.[3] Because I agree with his major findings and because of the thoroughness of his analysis there is no need to review Professor Corwin's work in this paper. Instead I will highlight several of the major issues which he raises and which seem to me to bear most directly on the process of using teacher education as an instrumentality for change. Hopefully, I will select the significant issues—those which will be most likely to continue to affect teacher education, the university, the profession and the public schools in important ways.

There are at least five issues and concepts to which change-oriented teacher educators must address themselves if future efforts are not to be doomed to replicate the errors of the past.

1. *Self-Improvement vs. Social Change.* Much useful effort is devoted to improving teacher education in which the programs themselves are conceived of as the ends. The assumption is made that if our programs are made competency based, or if they include internships, or if they place students in teams, then we have changed our programs for the better. The notion is clear that change means changing the process of teacher education itself and once the modifications are adopted, to consider that success has been achieved. Such a change concept should be clearly distinguished from the Teacher Corps, or Headstart Leadership Training, where the effort is to change something out in the real world and to alter whatever is necessary in teacher education programs merely as a means to some greater perceived social good. The "Right-to-Read" people, for example, would regard a change to be a success only if teacher education graduates could improve the reading of youngsters out in the real world and not simply because they had taken more reading courses. Such product concerns are a whole different level of change expectancy than those which deal with making more programs include the latest fad in higher education, and then feeling successful because we altered the workings of our college programs. Simply stated, it is necessary to know from the outset whether we are viewing teacher education programs as ends in themselves or as means for some relevant social purposes. Obviously, the change business is a lot easier and many more of us qualify as "successful" change agents, if the criterion of a change agent is to demonstrate that he has altered the nature of a college program. What happened in the conception of Teacher Corps was that several people who had become "change agent experts" because they had changed college programs were asked for advice on how to make the college programs instrumentalities for changing things out there (i.e., in the

schools and communities) and neither the "experts" nor those asking them for advice understood this distinction in the nature of the expertise required.

2. *Changing Content vs. Changing Structure.* Almost all of the important changes advocated and tried in teacher education deal with the structure, organization, finance, control, administration, scheduling and decision-making policy of the programs; few if any changes deal with the content of the programs. Even the current change to competency based programs, which would seem to be an exception to this generalization, is frequently an attempt to change the way we state objectives, the nature of the classes and practice sessions offered to students and the means used to evaluate preservice students.

Behavior modification, the theories of Piaget, or value clarification techniques are examples of changes in content, and while they are important, they are not usually conceived of as fundable innovations when government and foundations seek to support change efforts in teacher education. Our history has been one of funding new organizational arrangements such as NDEA summer institutes, intern programs, team-teaching and most recently, teacher renewal centers. The Teacher Corps was just one more example of our emphasis on structure rather than content. Corwin points to this paucity of ideas as one of the major reasons for the demise of various Teacher Corps programs.

> But no matter what the reasons were, the programs produced very little codified knowledge related to teaching in low income schools, as distinct from other types of schools, that could be disseminated to new generations of teachers.[4]

The immediate effect of new organizational structures such as Teacher Corps, was to generate enthusiasm among the trainees. When they discovered their professors could not recommend solutions to the problems of their children, however, they quickly became disillusioned.

> This desperate situation (lack of faculty, knowledge) frequently seemed to have a devastating effect on the creative impulses of the impatient and impetuous new teachers in the programs. Many of these teachers became disillusioned—some were radicalized, some were alienated, and some simply were defeated.[5]

What the drafters of the bill had created was one more innovative administrative arrangement which they naively assumed would *cause* content in teacher education to change. Unfortunately administrative rearrangements neither change nor increase the wisdom of the faculty.

3. *Publicly Supported vs. Professionally Derived Change Efforts.* Almost all of the change efforts in teacher education have originated from professionals or public officials. With the exception of Horace Mann and his immediate devotees who garnered widespread public support for training teachers in the first place, our history has been one of the public pressuring the schools but not having direct access to the training of teachers. Innovations such as the Teacher Corps not only lack public support, but since they are the brainchild's of professionals with reformers' instincts, they frequently fly in the face of the public will. There is no evidence that the congressional strangling of Teacher Corps' funds aroused much public concern; quite the contrary, the congress was reflecting the majority's feeling that the training of everyone's teachers and not just those serving the disadvantaged, should be upgraded.

Similarly, when interns began working in local school systems, there was little public awareness of or interest in, supporting changes in the interns' training programs. In most cases, interns were seeking to change schools which poor, rural and disadvantaged urban parents were seeking to improve, not radicalize. Most parents want their children to do better and for schools to be more effective, so that while most interns and other innovators were seeking important changes, they actually cut themselves off from public support.

The change business in teacher education has generally been characterized as isolating and protecting itself from public pressure. This has been an intelligent survival strategy, since most public pressure tends to be of a conservative or regressive nature. The current demands for financial cutbacks and teacher accountability are current examples of this emphasis. Academic freedom is just one of the many reasons for keeping teacher education out of the direct control of the public. Nevertheless, it must be noted, and Teacher Corps was a good example, that sweeping reform cannot be accomplished in the face of public apathy or antipathy. Nowhere in the drafting or the administration of Teacher Corps (or in the other major change efforts in teacher education), is there evidence of the awareness and need to gain public support. It's almost as if "the schools reflect society" is a truism the faculties teach their intern students but never seriously considered as applicable to themselves.

Public information and active public relations should be a part of every serious change effort. But it is beyond belief to expect a self-righteous, sanctimonious group such as Congress to openly approve public relations funds along with new teacher education programs.

4. *Cooperative vs. Conflict Models of Change.* The funding of programs insures that there will be "cooperation" between public schools and universities in spite of ample reason for believing that schools and universities cannot cooperate.[6]

> Compromise is an organized effort to take the edge off differences in order to proceed as usual, while continued contention with a polarization of interests is the process which leads to a clear victory (or defeat) for some group. It is not possible for organizations to simultaneously respond to both of these natural drives. To the extent that cooperation dominates, differences will be resolved (underplayed) and the organization will reestablish its old balance. When differences lead to clear cut triumphs for some contending force, however, the organization is jarred into a new kind of equilibrium. Most of us have been conditioned to value cooperation, not conflict; in this sense, most are predisposed to resist important organizational change.[7]

There is no need to review but to merely support Corwin's view at this point; it must be reemphasized that schools and colleges were supposed to "motivate" each other to change, yet if they actually got serious about the change business and really started trying to change each other, they both stood to lose their funds for not being able to cooperate. This incredible expectation that schools and universities should somehow "nicely" force each other to change while maintaining a facade of cooperation is, unfortunately, a common characteristic; the mechanism of requiring the ritual signatures of both organizations on grants, makes certain that they will only get funds if they don't take the business of changing each other too seriously.

5. *Individual Change vs. Group Action.* The model used in teacher education is one of upgrading individual practitioners. If each teacher can be taught to do a more effective job it is assumed that his pupils will learn more. The sum of individual good works is assumed to cumulate and have a direct causal relationship to making it a better world. No recognition is given to the organizational panoply which intervenes and prevents individuals from ever being touched by each other. In truth,

> Changing individuals does not change organizations. Improving individual efficiency does not lead to institutional effectiveness. Increasing the ability, effort or output of each participant is unrelated to the organization's success in achieving its ultimate objectives.[8]

On paper, the Teacher Corps tried to avoid this pitfall by subgrouping interns into teams that would support each other. Corwin's analysis, however, documents the reasons why these teams could not serve as genuine social structures. They were composed of virtual strangers who for temporary periods may have been

joined together, but who retained individualistic purposes for pursuing the program. The Teacher Corps, like most teacher education innovations, is characterized by the pious expectation that "the best way to change the world is to change yourself." It is essentially an existential, not an organizational, way of understanding and dealing with the social order. Reading through the intentions of those who framed the initial legislation, it is abundantly clear that individuals were to be recruited, individuals were to be trained, individuals were to teach disadvantaged pupils and ultimately, individuals' efforts were to turn the tide toward better education.

In summary, these five issues seem to me to be basic to Corwin's analysis of the lessons taught by the Teacher Corps experience and similar efforts to change teacher education. Every new change proposal should be expected to contend with these five issues by answering questions related to each of them: (1) Is the change effort aimed at changing some process of teacher education, or is it using teacher education as an instrumentality for affecting education on other levels in the real world? (2) Is the change effort fiddling with programs' structural arrangements or is there a substantive content basis to the changes it is advocating? (3) Is the change effort attempting to educate at least some portion of the public to gain lay support, or is it operating from the traditional stance of "the professionals know best"? (4) Does the change effort recognize the utility of a conflict model, or is it another naive attempt to get inherently antagonistic organizations to "cooperate"? and, (5) Is the change effort a sophisticated attempt to deal with realities of social systems and their complex organizations, or is it another pious admonition to make individuals play Don Quixote while keeping them away from the social system's machinery?

Prospects for Future Change

In a postscript to his analysis Corwin states:

> The valiant yet frustrating history of these governmental efforts raises serious questions about the federal government's capacity to lead social reforms and, indeed, about whether it is possible to make marked improvement solely by working from within the established institutions. Was the price of survival too high, in terms of limiting the effectiveness that it might have had? Can the federal-local coalition inducement strategy be made to work? Or is it necessarily self-defeating? My answer is that unless there is an unusual combination of circumstances . . . government programs are doomed at best to only modest accom-

plishments. Without the right conditions, modest improvement is about all that one should expect. Perhaps this is better than no improvement, regardless of how inefficient the programs may seem.[9]

I agree with this analysis but feel prompted to add that the universities, the school systems, the teacher's associations and the state departments of education share the federal government's propensities for improving but not markedly changing the basic nature of teacher education. Without widespread public support for significant changes in schools, it is unrealistic to expect that the teacher education component of our complex educational system can be seized upon, separated from the complementary institutions which support it and in this laboratory state of isolation, be radicalized.

Lack of intense public support for change in teacher education is not an indication of general negligence or indifference but the natural consequence of great diversity in the educational values and aspirations of the American people. The trend that should receive some public approval—at least in the larger public universities—is one of diversification. Students will be freer in the future to exercise some voice in the kind of preparation they receive and in actually having choices between programs that lead to the same certification.[10]

Several other major trends in the nature of teacher education change efforts also seem to be taking shape. There is a genuine internecine battle developing between teachers' associations and the universities over control of the accreditation machinery. In several states there are already professional standards boards, with a majority of classroom teachers, making decisions regarding which college programs to accredit; these boards also set standards related to particular certification requirements. This is a significant shift of power away from college faculty who dealt exclusively and directly with state department officials. While this may appear to be just another political battle which will not affect the content of teacher education, there is some reason to believe that an increase in practical how-to-do-it teacher education programs is a correlate of increased classroom teacher participation in the accreditation machinery. This is understandable since the public pressure on classroom teachers to be held accountable for pupils' learning would move classroom teachers to seek preparation which is more behavioral in its design.

A most exciting trend and one which is already taking shape, is the shift in the kind of students entering teacher education programs. The innovative, radical, socially conscious interns, described by Corwin as typifying the Teacher Corps and distinguishing it from the "regular" programs, are no longer distinctive. In the larger

institutions, students in teacher education not only represent the full spectrum of college youth, but frequently the most creative, socially aware and activist ones. Added to this potpourri are the new market students; those of all ages and social backgrounds who have not attended colleges and universities in previous times but who are now being attracted and provided with special programs. These groups not only include the full range of youth, but adults of all backgrounds and with myriad purposes.

Supporting this trend for greater student diversity is the beginning of a new movement in Schools of Education; this development of programs for people who want to study Education—as parents, consumers and changers of educational services—but who do not plan to seek teacher certification. These groups will alter the climate of Schools of Education, the expectations and values of their peers and faculty, and the nature of the coursework.

If teacher education is conceived narrowly as the preparation of classroom teachers for existing forms of public schooling, it is not difficult to predict that there will be continued mucking around, on a minor scale, some political conflict over accreditation and certification machinery, and little notable change in the content of programs. If teacher education is conceived broadly, as all the programs offered under the aegis of diversified Schools of Education in large universities, then there will be all manner of interesting shifts; more diverse student populations; more student choice in certification programs; more programs of a general professional nature which do not lead to any certification; more creative inservice arrangements; more new market programs including credit for previous life-work experiences; more behaviorally oriented competency-based programs and a simultaneous growth of more humanistic or open type programs. Undergirding these developments will be faculties that have grown just as diverse and conflicting as the varied student subgroups who will be attending.

But will any of these trends have any impact on lower forms of schooling? Only indirectly and in ways that cannot be systematically predicted. There is a historical basis and a conceptual basis, derived from the knowledge of organizational theory, to expect that teacher education will continue to be a reactive rather than an initiating system; that it will adjust to changes and pressures exerted by other forces but never be a change force itself.

It seems logical to me, therefore, to expect that future changes in elementary and secondary schools will not be readily attributable to what occurs or doesn't occur in Schools of Education. And, to support teacher education programs, offered under the aegis of Schools of Education, in the hope of effecting changes in lower levels of schooling or in other social systems in the real world, will be an even riskier business in the future than it was in the past.

[1] Martin Haberman. Testimony in Hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Education. Higher Education Act of 1965. U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington: 1965. pp. 1438-1439.

[2] Lindley J. Stiles. *Op. Cit.* p. 1446.

[3] Ronald G. Corwin. *Reform and Organizational Survival. The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change*. Wiley and Sons, New York; 1973.

[4] Ronald Corwin. *Op. Cit.* p. 377.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

[6] Martin Haberman. "Twenty-three Reasons Universities Cannot Educate Teachers." *The Journal of Teacher Education*. V. XXII, No. 2, Summer, 1971.

[7] Martin Haberman. "Educating Teachers: Changing Problems." Ch. 6 in *Freedom, Bureaucracy and Schooling* (V. F. Haubrich, ed.) ASCD, Washington, 1971, p. 117.

[8] Martin Haberman. *The Art of Schoolsmanship*. Warren Green Ad. Co., St. Louis: 1970. p. 7.

[9] Ronald Corwin. *Op. Cit.* p. 394.

[10] Martin Haberman and Will Roy. "The Multi-Program Approach to Teacher Education." *Education*. Vol. 92, No. 4, April-May, 1972. pp. 55-58.

6

Educators' Responses to Papers

Reactions to the Tumin Paper

Martin Haberman

The analysis of two basic change assumptions—those from the inside which attempt to move the system with inspirational force and those from the outside which seek to move and shake it with idealism, are presented as two delusions. The basic lack of understanding bureaucratic processes is presented as the fatal weakness in both approaches.

The author is quite honest in admitting that in analyzing the failure of the Teacher Corps, his analysis is no more prone to application than the post hoc study of Corwin. His discussion of the inevitable gap between theoretical models and the applied solutions to real-life problems is refreshing. One cannot help but wonder, however, about the large number of academics who accept consultant fees from government, foundations and business. If they agree with Tumin and still consult with people seeking answers to real-life problems, they are being dishonest. If they disagree with him, there's good reason to suspect they are incompetent, since the gap between theory and practice in every profession is now at the level of common information.

A most fascinating contention is that practitioners are as disfunctional as theoreticians at helping others to utilize practices which are working for them. Teachers, doctors, lawyers, etc. are described as unable to generalize in ways that can transfer to colleagues in other situations. The dilemma is presented as twofold: a generic gap between theory and practice and an inability for successful practitioners, in any field, to share ideas. This idea is explained but not fully developed; its logical extention is that knowledge is made useful by mystical, chance and indescribable means and that systematic planning of *professional* knowledge development is a contradiction in terms and a waste of time.

The essay is also stimulating in its summary of eight important points from the Corwin study. These conclusions all relate to the workings of large bureaucracies. While Tumin leads us to be less hopeful about the likelihood of being able to change anything important with known approaches, he, like Corwin, provides some added insights into the bureaucratic processes which prevent important change.

Minnie Kobltiz

After reading and indeed re-reading Mr. Tumin's paper, it appears to me to be speaking past most of us who are teachers and directly to his sociologist colleagues. However, many of his obser-

vations are important and indeed basic.

Especially valuable are his insights concerning some of our delusions. Examples include that highly motivated individuals sitting in a bureaucracy can reform a complex social educational system and that massive opposition to external forces involving establishing systems can be underestimated.

Surely, any school qualifies as a complex social system in itself, but it is also a sub-system of a larger one. Since this is so, one wonders why the advocates of alternative systems of education don't realize they are in for a rude awakening since it seems apparent that one facet of a social system cannot be altered if all the others remain the same. Social patterns are apparently interdependent, interlocking, and thus re-enforce each other; why then the delusion of instant solution via foreign intervention.

Teachers are becoming acutely aware of these delusions. It is our whole system that needs reform, not merely schools. Changing our national priorities is now a major issue within the organized teaching profession. Mr. Tumin has made it clear how difficult such reformation will be, but more important he also makes a case for how essential reformation has become.

Mario D. Fantini

Mel Tumin's analysis deals skillfully with the ever present problem of matching theory to practice. One senses from his paper that the ease with which he moves into both the world of theory and practice gives him a special license to try to link the two. In fact, his paper itself is symbolic of the dilemma of trying to achieve a fruitful match between the abstract and the applied, although both are admittedly necessary, and does not seem to be at present a mechanism for bridging these two domains.

On the one hand, we appear to have developed one set of professional criteria which proclaims the need for the conceptual and analytic, and on the other hand, we have what appears to be even a more powerful push to concentrate on the real, the practical and the applied. It appears in the field of teacher education this dichotomy is particularly sharp. Those who prepare educational personnel have to deal with the culture of higher education which emphasizes the abstract. They also must deal increasingly with the environment of the practitioner and his demand for knowledge which is useful. This schizophrenia plays havoc with innovation and change. Although we have known this for some time, each time we have a new "model" presented such as that of Corwin's, we invariably must be reminded of this gap. Professor Tumin gives us a contemporary version of the split. The frustrating problem with this paper, as with

some of the others, is that one is not quite sure what recommendations one can make to get out of a particular box. While Tumin tries to inch us toward some recommendation by summarizing the lessons we have learned thus far, he rightfully stops short and presents his own paper as an example of the dilemma inherent in any attempt to tie an analytical model to clinical implementation. Tumin's paper stands as an astute reminder of this ever-present danger.

Donald M. Sharpe

Dr. Tumin is a most exciting and stimulating scholar who in this paper does much to clarify the relationship between theory and practice or as he terms it, the relationships or lack of relationships between the scientist and the clinical practitioner—or the "gap between the knowledge of how things work and the ability to make them work."

His conclusion that it is no mean accomplishment to use "high intelligency, scientific perspicacity and very hard work . . . to become wise after the fact about complex systems," is a high compliment to Corwin and his staff.

Tumin's descriptions of the delusions regarding programs for social change from the right and from the left are exciting and helpful. His analysis of Richard Graham's rational for the Teacher Corps is consistent with my experience with him.

His summary of what we have learned from the Corwin study, for that matter, his whole paper—should be provided all readers of the report—because he cuts through the technical analysis and states the conclusions in terms that anyone can understand.

Carl and Gloria Grant

Melvin Tumin's paper provides several excellent reasons as to why social reform models conceptualized in a laboratory environment have little or no success when implemented in the real world. He states:

> . . . gaps between absolute scientific knowledge and practical, clinical application are generic, and the gaps cannot be closed or abridged in any particular case without a great deal more concrete specification, for which the absolute model provides no guidelines, except a kind of inventory of relevant variables.

He further notes that, "Most teachers, doctors, social workers, lawyers, whatever, are incapable of specifying the ingredients of the 'successes' in ways that are useful to others who might wish to

emulate them; and certainly not in any *generally* useful way."

These reasons and others are given by Professor Tumin for the great difficulty in moving from the theoretical model to successful implementation in the real world. These reasons also provide the reader with several courses to examine the implementation, strategies, and techniques of the reform programs of the sixties.

Reactions to the Koblitz Paper

Mario D. Fantini

Minnie Koblitz draws into very sharp focus the importance of the classroom teacher. No actual innovation or reform has a chance of succeeding without reaching the teacher. Mrs. Koblitz reminds us all that the world of the teacher is filled with practical problems. She is concerned that well intentioned people who develop abstract accounts of life in the school and classroom may miss the practical frame of reference of the teacher. In a very real sense, then, Mrs. Koblitz's paper underscores the dilemma which Professor Tumin outlines in his paper. Mrs. Koblitz seems to be saying that given the reality setting in which teachers must work, that knowledge which is practical is of the most worth to the teacher. Said somewhat differently, most practicing teachers would not know what to do with the Corwin findings. Although there are obvious connections, it is difficult to concretize these in such a way that they connect with the teacher's frame of reference. On the other hand, Mrs. Koblitz embraces one of the recurring themes in the Corwin analysis (as in many other studies) that teacher participation in innovation and reform is an essential ingredient. It is at this point that some confusion arises. On the one hand, Mrs. Koblitz appropriately focuses on the *individual classroom teacher*, and on the other, she begins to talk about *teachers* and teachers as part of a professional association. She appears to use these terms interchangeably, however, there are very real differences and they effect fundamentally the process of institutional reform. It is one thing to deal with the teacher as a member of a teachers' union with its own collective agenda. While it is difficult to argue with the concept of involving individual teachers in planning and development, it is not so easy to make the same argument for teachers' unions. This difference takes on added importance, and we realize that any innovation, change or reform deals with the politics of education. Unfortunately, or fortunately, depending on how you want to look at it, public education is an arena of power politics with vested interest agendas controlling the groundrules. Teachers as individuals are not as potent politically as teachers collectively. Because of the oppressed role played by

teachers in the history of American education, the teachers have been forced to collect in order to improve their status. Increasingly, however, teacher organizations have begun to speak for teachers on all matters. I am concerned that the integrity of the individual teacher not be compromised during this period. This is a roundabout way of saying that Mrs. Koblitz does not make clear whether she believes that teachers' associations ought to be the major participants in reform or that individual teachers should represent themselves in the participatory process. Once again, I must underscore that the agenda of the individual teacher may differ sharply from that of the teachers' association. I realize the dilemma this poses, but, on balance, I lean toward the strong and complete involvement of individual teachers as professionals. While teachers' associations are best prepared to participate in bargaining for bread and butter items, the teachers as individual professionals should participate in the more substantive problems of curriculum and instruction. This difference is no small matter to any overview of school reform, whether it deals with urban, suburban or rural education.

Carl and Gloria Grant

Minnie Koblitz's essay provides many insightful observations, perhaps the most significant observation she offers is the need for the active involvement of the classroom teacher at all levels of educational design, i.e., evaluation, assessment and program development.

Ms. Koblitz's suggestion that we need to police our profession more vigorously is important, however, we feel that it is more important to place a high standard of competency at the exit point in a teacher training program than at the entrance to the teacher training program.

One other thought that kept recurring to us as we read Ms. Koblitz's paper is, "What can be done to help or remove those teachers, professors and administrators who are systematically stymieing the academic growth of students for whom they are responsible for providing an education?"

Donald M. Sharpe

Mrs. Koblitz provides a classic example of reading into a paper one's own concerns. Her association with the N.E.A. Council on Instruction and Professional Development has made her aware of the problem of accountability.

Her paper highlights the need for the planned publication of a popularized version of the study. Her description of an ideal teach-

ing environment reflects the central role teachers play in the education of teachers. It does not recognize the roles—important roles—played by administrators and boards of education. It does not seem to provide for citizen control of education.

Interns did feel that they were "co-opted" by the system and were frustrated by the bureaucracy and inertia. Perhaps training institutions were at fault in not adequately preparing idealistic interns to cope with the realities of schools, especially urban schools. Interns were often over zealous in imposing their preconceived models and unskilled in obtaining voluntary acceptance. They seemed to be typical of many reformers who are a bit too sure they are right. As Judge Learned Hand said, "The spirit of liberty is the spirit that is not too sure it is right." While the teaching profession does need to have more influence in the preparation of teachers and the operation of the schools, the pupils' parents and society must be the final authority.

Martin Habermann

This paper is a healthy dose of realism directed at the Corwin study, but much more at some of the basic assumptions of the whole Teacher Corps approach. Ms. Koblitz is, in effect, stating that ways of improving teachers are already well-known to practicing teachers and not still to be searched out via naive government projects. Her list of sixteen specific ways to improve the teaching environments of schools requires no federal grants or additional research. It does, however, require faith in the classroom teachers and this is the exact reverse of the philosophy which undergirds the monies thus far expended for improving schools and programs of teacher education.

This essay provides an approach to the problems of school improvement which the other papers have understated or missed; the prominent position of teachers and teacher organizations in change efforts. Further, the author emphasizes more than after-the-fact cooperation. She calls for the involvement of teachers in planning and developing school programs and teacher education. The reason this position is so startling is that the usual assumption is that teachers cannot contribute either creative or specific solutions to school problems, and that teachers are the *cause* of school problems. Urban schools have racist teachers who can't teach basic skills to minorities; suburban schools have traditional teachers who can't deal with the generation gap; all schools are burdened by ineffective teachers who oppose change—organizationally and as individuals. Not only Teacher Corps, but every major educational change effort, assumes that teachers are, at best, to be trained to do what experts have developed, or at worst, to be treated as the major obstacle to

school improvement.

The author's point of teacher involvement extends to teacher education and the selection of future teachers. An important factor is the recognition of teacher organizations as a political force so that the ideas expressed are not offered in the context of individual teachers who must be individually involved as free-lance professionals.

A reading of this essay before-the-fact would have changed the drafting of the original Teacher Corps Bill; the determination of who should be hired to administer the Corps; the decision of which colleges and schools would be funded; the guidelines for selecting Corpsmen; and the criteria used by Corwin in evaluation of the whole adventure. It is important to pursue the ideas introduced in this paper to finally halt the mass production of Teacher Corps debacles.

Reactions to the Fantini Paper

Minnie Koblitz

Mr. Fantini believes in the alternative schools movement. His analysis of the problems of education and the need for reform are convincing. His implied solution is not so convincing because he tends to hedge. His alternative schools are institutions. What is needed is individual options. Alternative schools per se could conceivably create a new form of segregation, even though their educational alternatives are established within the context of public schools.

Is not the real issue to create individualized programs for all children and students? This means options for all children (students) based upon their respective needs. And individualizing programs shouldn't be confused with individualized instruction . . . Alternative schools or programs may lead to tracks.

Mr. Fantini suggests federal monies for retooling professional staffs. We hope some of those staff people are involved in the decisions of how such monies are to be used . . . Teachers know about the obsolescence in the system—and they know that the motivational forces which give rise to our school systems must be directed into alternative ways of rewarding the principal characters if change is to stick. Merely analyzing and describing the present condition isn't enough—the Corwin study is illustrative. Have we learned the lesson?

Donald M. Sharpe

Dr. Fantini provides a bridge between the abstract world of insti-

tutional reform and the actual world of doing something to change the schools today. Corwin's book needs this. As a matter of fact, the NEA Advisory Committee recommended a publication on the non-technical or popular level. This, I understand, is in process.

Sociologists may find the data and its treatment very helpful in refining their theories of institutional change. Administrators and teacher educators will find Fantini's analysis and his own ideas very useful.

Of the "interrelated forces operative in Urban Education" identified by Fantini, four of them were at the forefront of the original Teacher Corps thinking: Racism, Diversity and Cultural Pluralism, Uniformity in Patterns of Schooling, Change Agent Strategy. Unionization of teachers was not a central problem when the Teacher Corps was originated. Power Politics has been very much in evidence all-be-it unofficially, in the maneuvering of universities and schools to obtain a Teacher Corps project, in the administrative gyrations of the Washington, D. C. office and in the frantic changes of direction that have characterized the recent years of the Teacher Corps.

Certainly the original role of the Teacher Corps as a change agent was not one of "imposition" or administrative direction. Changes were to spin-off from a successful endeavor. Changes in Teacher Education would grow from the experience of having some money and personnel to try out ideas.

Changes in the schools were to result from additional personnel and facilities to meet the needs plus a new breed of teachers and educated in the Liberal Arts tradition.

My personal research confirms the ineffectiveness of administration ordered change. A follow-up study of curriculum innovations usually brought this reply: "We are no longer following that curriculum. Mr. _____ who introduced it, is no longer with us."

Dr. Fantini's evaluation of intervention efforts conforms with my experience. The NEA sponsored Task Force 72 did provide help at the local level with teachers, pupils and parents, and did make some changes in school practices and even Teacher Education. (See *Teacher Designed Reform in Teacher Education*, U. S. Office of Education, Project No. 1-0683, Edelfelt, et al: August 1972.)

To say that universities viewed the Teacher Corps as a major agency for reforming education is overly dramatic. They did see its money as some long needed Federal funds to provide time and some educational hardware for teacher educators. The Science people had been having this kind of money ever since Sputnik. Many educators were alarmed at the thought of Arts majors moving into teaching but were satisfied when they had to accumulate the credits required for certification. Many colleges also ...oped to provide some supplementary help to ghetto schools in the f... n of extra teachers,

guidance people, reading helpers, community workers. This was not to reform the school except insofar as its successes were to be emulated by other teachers.

Corwin's conclusion that the quality of the colleges and the liberalism of faculty members interfered with cooperation (p. 289) raises a dilemma for one who would introduce change. It raises some questions about the flexibility of "liberals." It also raises the question of co-opting by the institution.

Dr. Fantini's faith in "attraction and choice" fails to take into account the crucial role of individual counseling. Our school systems are notoriously lax in providing data necessary for an intelligent choice. Students and their parents are not aware of the students' needs and aptitudes and no one understands the effects of schooling on different persons. Perhaps a program which has some components of required experiences and demonstrable competencies could be supplemented by alternative experiences for part of the day. Society as well as the individual needs to be served.

Carl and Gloria Grant

Professor Fantini accurately identifies racism, unionization of teachers, diversity and cultural pluralism, uniformity in pattern of schooling change-agent strategy and power politics as a set of interrelated forces which are operative in urban education. Racism is the force that, more than any of the others described, is the major cause of inequality in education and racism is also the reason that urban education needs to be reformed.

Another wise observation by Dr. Fantini is the important lessons hopefully learned from previous intervention programs. These lessons are:

1. Compensatory, add-on, more-of-the-same efforts have limited rewards.
2. No one approach to education works for everyone.
3. Imposition of a plan invites divisiveness, hostility and power politics.
4. New money used in old ways does not seem to increase educational productivity.
5. Participation by the agents closest to the action: parents, students and teachers, is important to program understanding, support and implementation.

He further adds, "any urban education reform plan that is proposed today must demonstrate that, indeed, it has learned the lesson."

Dr. Fantini's suggestion that, "given the overt racism of our

society, it would have been a more realistic strategy to begin the Teacher Corps as an innovative model," is an interesting thought, even an idea that offers great potential for study. Nevertheless, the use of the word *begin* means that the first Teacher Corps Programs would have been implemented with middle class schools and later the Teacher Corps concept would have been implemented with minority groups and low socio-economic people. This idea is in contradiction to the goals and ambitions of minorities who are tired of being treated second and unequal.

Martin Habermann

One of the several important themes in the Fantini essay is the recognition that educational change moves from the affluent to the poor and not vice versa. The efforts to improve education by compensatory approaches is analyzed and exposed as an attempt to preserve and adjust the clients to the schools, rather than to radically change the schools.

The forces discussed as controlling urban education are a partial but accurate accounting of the most powerful influences on urban schools. Similarly, Fantini's five "lessons" for the urban educator also represent a sophistication and sensitivity obviously developed at the price of some bruising personal experiences. On the basis of this background the author outlines a proposal for changing urban schools which goes beyond the usual voucher proposals and suggests that individual parents, students and teachers can develop alternative schools that are directly and immediately responsive to their particular needs and aspirations. The assumptions are made that if those who are "closest to the action" make the decisions there will be significant change and that the change will be an improvement over present forms of schooling.

It is interesting that Professor Fantini, who is one of our most knowledgeable deans, sees no role for schools of education in his outline for effecting genuine change. One can only conclude that he either regards the Corwin data related to changing institutions of teacher education as of secondary importance, or, that *he* sees no significant role for schools of education in affecting urban schools.

Reactions to Carl and Gloria Grant's Paper

Mario D. Fantini

Gloria and Carl Grant attempt to establish a frame of reference which links federal intervention to educational reform, which would benefit minorities. Their statement is a useful reminder that the

purposes of the federal educational legislation were in terms of helping poor children learn. This objective remains with us in the 70's and beyond. The authors are rightfully concerned that the growing criticism of the results of the federal educational legislation may take the spotlight away from the yet unsolved problem, i.e., whether we are talking about compensatory education or the Teacher Corps, the verdict increasingly seems to me that these programs did not work. During an inflationary period, the problem is likely to demand cutbacks in the programs that have not worked. In so doing, they occasion a lower priority to the problem of the poor. The Grants seem to admit that compensatory programs were based on the wrong side of the assumption, i.e., they were based on the assumption that there was something wrong with the sub-culture, mostly poor, who did not seem to profit from the standard educational process which was itself oriented toward mainstream culture society. In one sense, this was a continuation of the trend toward trying to homogenize, assimilate the diverse cultures into one colossal middle-class mold. This has not and, indeed, cannot work. It is racist in nature and should be replaced by one that promotes cultural diversity.

In one sense, then, the authors are concerned that new public policy will not profit from this important lesson—from compensatory education to cultural diversity—but will "throw out the baby with the bath water." It is one thing to call for a change in federal legislation affecting the poor. It is quite another to reduce it or dismantle it altogether. In the case of minorities, the Federal government becomes a last court of appeals, becomes the agency which has the clout to enforce equalization policies. If the Federal government gives up this role, then minorities are left to the more parochial policies which may be in operation at different quarters of the country. One of their significant contributions, therefore, is to make salient the notion that while we can be critical of the mistakes made by the Federal government in the form and shape of the educational legislation which it sponsored, we should not be pushed into a corner of disavowing its political importance to contemporary educational reform.

Minnie Koblitz

We learn from Grant and Grant that "federal intervention programs are not inherently bad." The Corwin study says to me there may be something inherently bad in federal intervention into certain aspects of education. Federal guidelines which invade the pedagogical domain just could be "bad." The melting pot concept which became an American syndrome was in great degree caused by fed-

eral intervention. The melting pot idea is the antithesis of pluralism.

Very few teachers would disagree with the Grants' observation that "academic achievement should not and must not be the sole basis for determining the effectiveness of any educational project." However, what agency has given credence to the "academic achievement" syndrome if not the federal government? Where did the accountability movement get started? To paraphrase the authors, with tongue in cheek, "there's nothing inherently bad about accountability." But system is is what system does and so far the accountability movement is hurting more than helping.

Martin Haberman

In essence, this is a summary of why compensatory education is not an educational movement but a process of political compromise. The motivations of lawmakers, as well as the pressures and constraints operating on their decision-making processes, makes any rhetoric about equalizing educational opportunities for minorities naive at best and cynical debauchery at worst.

The most valuable portion of this essay is the logical case it builds for understanding how standardized testing is made ***the*** inevitable criterion for accounting for federal funds and thereby becomes ***the*** inevitable major objective of curricula in the various programs. The consequence of this testing syndrome has merely fed the critics of federal support who can point to "no significant results," at the same time it has destroyed the aspirations of teachers and students who become obsessed with basics, since that is the only form of progress that can be proven. The relative neglect of just about every important educational objective to feed this need for objective data about skills development, is now a well-known eulogy for the burial of the innovative spirit in education.

A major value of this essay is the basis it provides for not only questioning the concept of compensatory education, but advocating the notion of cultural pluralism. After making a convincing case for exploring new evaluative techniques—ones that will not narrow down the concept of education to skills improvement—the authors suggest that the whole approach of compensation might be replaced with the more positive approach of cultural pluralism.

To serious students of the compensatory movement in education, this is a brief but comprehensive summary. For those seeking new directions, this essay will help to direct rethinking the problem of making schools more successful in new ways. I was motivated to intensify the search for sociological truths about changing the system, rather than to continue studying the content of compensatory education programs.

Donald M. Sharpe

The paper by the Grants includes an effective colorful, thumbnail analysis of the main educational movements in the United States.

They correctly, in my opinion, assessed the attitudes of educators toward the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to wit: It was seen primarily as a breakthrough for federal funding of public education and only secondarily as a major thrust for educational reform.

At first reading I got the feeling that this was prepared for another purpose and then re-cycled for the Teacher Corps Conference, until I reread the conference title.

This paper is a most useful critique of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the 1965 O.E.O. Project Head Start. Its summaries of issues and disputed conclusions, while brief, are scholarly and comprehensive. Most relevant research studies were analyzed. No doubt the paper was prepared before the Jenck's study: *(Inequality—A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America,* Basic Books 1972) because that study was not mentioned. It should be considered.

This paper seems to me to accurately reflect the current depressed state of educational reform and minority education. It falls short of despair.

Reactions to the Haberman Paper

Carl & Gloria Grant

Professor Haberman's manuscript is an excellent commentary on many of the assumptions, concepts and issues facing teacher education today. He provides a very provocative beginning by identifying five assumptions (see page 1) that professors of education believe about themselves and teacher education. These assumptions, in fact have caused teacher educators to perform as if they were in slow motion or wearing blinders.

Secondly, Professor Haberman, in his testimony in the Hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Education in 1965, gave the committee five excellent recommendations. These recommendations are presently being implemented in Teacher Corps programs. The recommendations include a discussion of the following important issues: (1) public school-university cooperations, (2) future dissemination, (3) freedom to introduce innovations, (4) concentration of new personnel and (5) independent evaluation.

Although we agree with Professor Haberman's recommendations, we would like to see them also encompass the following points. In his first recommendation, "public school-university co-

operation," it is essential to include community and student cooperation and involvement. Community and student cooperation and involvement should be on par as public school and university cooperation and involvement. In his fifth recommendation, "independent evaluation," the community, state departments of education and students should be included on the evaluation panel.

Thirdly, Professor Haberman's identification of (1) self-improvement vs. social change, (2) changing content vs. changing structure, (3) publicly supported vs. professionally derived change efforts, (4) cooperative vs. conflict models of change and (5) individual change vs. group action, as "five issues and concepts to which change oriented teacher educators must address themselves to if future efforts are not to be doomed to replicate the error of the past," is the major contribution of the paper. In his discussion of these issues and concepts he provides many insightful observations.

> . . . it is necessary to know from the outset whether we are viewing teacher education programs as ends in themselves or as means for some relevant social purpose.
>
> Almost all of the important changes advocated and tried in teacher education deal with the structure, organization, finance, control, administration, scheduling and decision-making policy of the programs; few if any changes deal with the content of the programs.

We are puzzled by Dr. Haberman's statement, "Lack of intense public support for change in teacher education is not an indication of general negligence or indifference but the natural consequence of great diversity in the educational values and aspirations of the American people." The puzzlement occurs because we think the comment is offered without truly acknowledging that teacher education programs have neglected millions of minority group persons in our society.

Donald M. Sharpe

Dr. Haberman accurately recaptures the spirit of the original Teacher Corps. I only wish he had mentioned the amount of lobbying done to persuade members of Congress.

As the National Teacher Corps (the term "National" was subsequently deleted to alleviate some local misgivings) was originally conceived many of the "keepers of the *status quo*" were committed to change. Notably many state departments of education modified their requirements for certification. Original proposals were jointly developed by colleges and public schools. The cooperation, as Bernard Watson[1] reported frequently became co-optation as schools

began to dominate the program planning and contract with complaisant local colleges or extension departments.

Dr. Haberman alludes to one of the fatal flaws of the program: the lack of any training program in change strategy and its problems.

I wish someone trained as a sociologist had compared the issues Corwin raises with those raised by the Jencks report. (Jencks, C. and others *Inequality—A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America.* Basic Books, 1972.)

I am a bit disturbed by Haberman's analysis of means-ends relationships. It is true that they are often confused. They cannot be treated separately and one cannot be realistically concerned with ends without paying attention to means. One university has proclaimed its devotion to Performance Based Teacher Education but the only specific steps it has taken is to plan extensive field based experiences. The Teacher Corps may have been guilty of many things but it was not unmindful of the interrelationship between means and ends.

Again I want to quarrel with Haberman. To my mind the original Teacher Corps was not simply a new structure or administrative arrangement. It introduced a new population into teacher education—liberal arts graduates. It organized new orientation programs with new content. It utilized new hardware—VTR's. It made extensive use of schools and communities and it developed the role of the team leader—teacher of teachers drawn from the teaching ranks. These were fundamental departures in goals content and methodology. True enough these radical changes were dulled by the abrasive resistance of institutions.

I would insist that changes did occur—changes in what the universities had to work with—changes in Mary, Jose, Franklin and Suzie, who had attention paid to them—changes in college curricula when interns learned about community pressure and school isolation. The Corps did not bring about Utopia, but it really never hoped to. I am reminded of the phrase: "You say the things I do will never change the world. I never thought they would but I maintain beyond debate, the right to choose which side shall feel the feeble ounces of my weight."

I still feel that "Some educators are now convinced that the relatively small amount of money invested in the Teacher Corps has paid greater dividends than if it had been diffused in the appropriation of the basic Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Teacher Corps has provided funds for a nucleus of interested educators to experiment with costly equipment and students from different backgrounds. It has taken professors into schools and communities. Educators are discovering that old answers cannot simply be rearranged but that worlds of new questions need to be asked and

alternative answers found. The Corps program has challenged educators to experiment in a field in which research has provided few solid benchmarks."[2]

Dr. Haberman aptly summarized the emerging stance of the teaching profession as reported in Ms. Koblitz's paper. His optimism about the type of student going into education is not shared by me. Students seem more conservative, solicitous and, if you please, square, as the job opportunities become more restricted. I agree with him and Fantini that changes in the public schools will not be produced by the teacher preparatory institution.

Minnie Koblitz

Both Mr. Tumin and Mr. Haberman are somewhat infatuated with our delusions.

Mr. Haberman has included delusions of (1) relevant knowledge, (2) omniscience, (3) authenticity, (4) significance, and (5) power, which, taken in total, equals self-fulfilling prophecy. Between Tumin and Haberman, we're certainly reduced to the state of being deluded! But as a practical teacher the question of what the hell are we going to do about it becomes irrepressible.

We also learn from Mr. Haberman not to expect much help from schools of education . . . where to turn?—do we really throw in the sponge? Can't someone at least begin the dialogue about how to survive? Or is this a delusion of over-optimism. Can anyone believe in the future?

Audacity drives me to suggest that the delusion of constant analysis *without* "putting it together" is an academic delusion that a profession can't afford.

Mario D. Fantini

Martin Haberman reviews the role of teacher education as an instrument for change. Since the Teacher Corps itself was conceived as an instrument for institutional change and not simply as a "way to recruit enthusiastic individuals," it represents a forerunner of a new role and responsibility for teacher education generally. To accept the responsibility as a major instrumentality for institutional reform, teacher education must of necessity change itself. To do so would require a process of conversion that would itself trigger a host of restrictive political forces. While Haberman seems to place little stock in the administrative rearrangements, he is equally pessimistic about trying to change individuals. In his opinion, neither of these change institutions. He feels that these conclusions are supported by Corwin's analysis. Also, Haberman

has doubts about the role of the Federal government in the reform process and in so doing does not take heed of the warnings projected in the Grants' paper. On the other hand, Haberman does draw our attention to the important role that public support plays in the process of initiating and legitimizing educational change. It is interesting to note that the concept of consumerism in education has not been given the attention that it rightfully deserves in these papers. Haberman seems to be ambivalent about public support. He appears to think that it is necessary for achieving reform and handled through a process of public relations. It is not clear whether he feels that the public participation is a right—not a privilege—and essential to the democratic process of public accountability of all our public institutions, including the schools.

Haberman seems to be equally ambivalent about the role of the professional educator. This is especially the case when he begins to offer his framework which would expand the role of teacher education as an instrument of institutional change. Among these ingredients are more diversity in student populations, increasing student choice in certification programs, more behaviorally oriented, competency based programs. Each of these ingredients has met with considerable professional opposition. Nonetheless, the Haberman paper is an astute recap of the conditions which surround teacher education as it attempts to redefine its role.

[1] Watson, Bernard C., *The Taming of a Reform: Co-optation of the National Teacher Corps*. University of Chicago, 1968.

[2] Sharpe, Donald M., "The National Teacher Corps—Where To?" *Journal of Teacher Education*, XVIII, 2, Summer 1967.

7

Sociologists' Responses to Papers

Forward We March Back to First Principles

by Melvin M. Tumin

Now that we have read Corwin's report and our own commentaries we are all wise after the fact; but that is a lot better than not being wise at all. Or, it will prove to be a lot better if we can now use the after-the-fact wisdom effectively *before* the fact, next time around, wherever and whenever that may be.

Yet I have serious doubts that we will be much better next time. The simple reason is that each of us, in commenting on Corwin's book, played his same, familiar tune on his old fiddle. Our papers were all a bunch of "I told you sos"—maybe put a little more graciously, but not very well concealed. Thus, as a sociologist who takes perverse pleasure when things don't work well, I took special note of the massive institutional resistances from ongoing social structures to the innovative attempts of the Teacher Corps. As a classroom specialist, Minnie Koblitz saw the report as the occasion to stress once again the failure to utilize the clinician's insights and reiterated her prescription for an ideal teaching environment. As people deeply concerned with doing something substantial for minority children, the Grants were properly anxious that the present report shall not give even further occasion for reducing special programs aimed at minority children, and they stressed the need for more-than-academic criteria of program effectiveness. As a former agent of Change and now an agent of Forms and Structures, Mario Fantini recited his familiar litany of racism, diversity, cultural pluralism, teacher union power and power politics, and then went on to embrace the newest enthusiasm called "alternatives." Finally, Haberman, quoting himself at length, yet relevantly, warned us once again, but properly, that changing programs won't necessarily change children, and that changing structures doesn't mean changing content, and changing yourself doesn't mean changing the world. He takes his own words to heart, when, as a Professor of Education, he finally estimates that changing teacher education programs in Schools of Education is not likely to result in many changes in "the real world" out there. But he, too, ends by reciting the new enthusiasms for diversification of training programs, more student choice, using uncertified people, giving "credit" for life experiences, and more openness and humanistic orientation.

It is clear, at least to me, why we have reacted the way we did. Simply it is because we have only a little knowledge, a great deal

more concern and, in some cases, an even greater amount of a magical kind of optimism and enthusiasm. It is a formula we are all familiar with: a little pinch of knowledge and a great deal of enthusiasm, plus a clamor for change, gets programs initiated and financed.

But I must be a hundred and ten years older than everyone else who read and wrote about Corwin's book, or else I could not be so obviously less optimistic and enthusiastic than the others. I keep hearing Swinburne's marvelous stanza:

I am tired of tears and laughter,
Of men who laugh and weep,
Of what may come hereafter,
For men who sow to reap,
I am weary of days and hours,
Desires and dreams and powers,
Blown buds of barren flowers,
And everything but sleep.

Since I first learned those lines as an undergraduate at Madison, while walking along the shores of Lake Mendota, it seems fitting to recite them now, for they seem to me appropriate not only to my own mood (which is my own problem) but also to the situation in hand, especially when it is viewed against the last 40 years of enthusiastic involvement in social change programs. Yet realistically I know that however strong the temptation to lie down and let this next wave of enthusiasm pass over, some active involvement in it is indispensable to getting something a little bit better into the system in which we all live. I know, too, that without enthusiasm and optimism, publicly evinced in a persuasive way, nothing new will happen. Not that anything new is likely to be much better than anything old. But it might be.

So when I read, as I just did, in the *New York Times* of Dec. 11, about miracles and wonders that have been worked in compensatory education programs in the state of Michigan, I cannot help but react in two utterly different ways. First, I feel utter skepticism. "Wait until the data are re-examined," I say to myself, "and this too will prove fraudulent." Then, or simultaneously, I feel a slight twinge of hope that maybe something *has* been found. But when I see that it seems to be largely a matter of getting more teachers into the classroom to really "put it to the kids," in the form of continuous drill and training in reading, writing and arithmetic, I can't help but laugh a little, because, in effect, that's what most teachers

and most schools are really doing today, and have always done in this country's school system.

The difference is that in earlier years they had to care about and do it to a far smaller percent of the school children. Today they have to care about and do it to a much larger percent. So today, in order to do what they have always done in the past, they simply have to have more time, more teachers, more per capita expenditures, and they don't have them. So they can't do today what they did yesterday.

Those who have said that yesterday's system won't work for today's world may be very wrong. For if yesterday's system could really be expanded and deepened enough to be as effective with all the new school children as it was yesterday for a smaller number of children, it probably would produce the same results. And what in the world was so bad about yesterday's result for the children *who were cared about?* And what would be wrong about trying to duplicate that for today's children?

The basic ingredients of yesterday's program are clear enough: (1) Skilled, strong teachers; (2) Deep concern on the part of teachers for being "academically successful" with their selected and favored students; (3) Strong parental support for this limited mission of preparing children for life and work after school; (4) The ability of students who mean to go on with school to see the value of succeeding, and being able to see this because they see the pay-off in successful schooling; (5) full administrative support for all of the above.

Why can't all this be done today? Well, everyone can recite a long list of obstacles, including lack of strong, skilled teachers; lack of equal concern for all students; lack of parental support; lack of an horizon of "payoff" in the minds of the students; lack of administrative support. And there are diagnosable sources of these major obstacles. These include variable amounts and depths of institutionalized racism; inadequate financing at all levels; lack of knowledge about how to deal with some young people's new visions of desirable lives, to which the schools seem irrelevant; a far greater democratization of power and decision making among boards, administrators and teachers, and even in some few cases, among students themselves, and the concomitant absence of proper structures for adopting this new structure of decision making to today's schools.

There are, of course, many more of these fountains of trouble. But the few just cited will do for now, with just one further addition. This last one may be most crucial of all. It has to do with the failure to recognize that today's school systems are probably just what we should expect them to be, given what our society is like. The evidence of that lack of realistic expectation is most visible in the

"blame them" model of evaluation. Blame the teachers; or blame the parents; or blame the students; or blame the government; or blame the administrators. But really, who can blame the teachers for organizing and collectivizing their power, given their experiences with arbitrariness by administrators and boards and "communities"? And who can blame the parents for their open hostility? And who can blame the students for acting out their new visions of life? And who can blame the government for not knowing what to do, ever? And who can blame the Blacks? And the Chicanos? And the Jews? And the lower middle class white ethnics? Why should any of them have a deeper sense of responsibility to the totality of the enterprise than any of the other groups have? Given the totally expectable conflict about the schools, how could we possibly expect anything other than that every interest group will seek to maximize its well being? Whom can anyone trust to go beyond self-interest, narrowly conceived? It is indeed extraordinary that every so often various of these groups do venture, albeit timidly, onto the margins of mutuality, reciprocity and trust.

Ah, but there is light and hope out there. Where? In the sheer, hard, ineluctable fact that all this fighting and debate and argument and confrontation deal with the school system. Everyone knows, it seems, that the school system is an absolutely crucial structure in this society. If you need to test out the worth of those claims and proposals, just imagine your own kids locked up in a closet from birth, and figure how much of what they will know about what. Or, leave them out of the closet and let them roam the streets. What will they know about what? What will they care about? What will they be able to do? Rip off everybody else more effectively? That line of argument is sheer trash.

The inescapable fact is that most of the people know full well that schools and schooling are critical. Not the same ***amount*** of schools, necessarily, for everyone; not the same ***kind*** of schools for everyone; nor the same ***rhythm*** of schooling for everyone. But schooling, yes; training, yes; learning, yes; acquiring life-saving and life-giving skills, yes. How could these claims be denied? What are the alternatives to those prospects?

So it is the schools and their effective performance that everyone is fighting about. And, all things considered, that's pretty good and hopeful mostly because none but the smallest handful of nuts, however inspired, takes the "deschooling" thesis seriously. Just think for a moment about how well schooled Father Ilyitch has been, and how many years of formal training went into his arriving at his "deschooling" notion. ***He*** makes me wonder about the beneficial effects of school. But then he's almost a solitary, or at least a rare, case.

If you can't see why it is an optimistic sign that people are fighting

about the schools, consider the utterly different quality of the arguments about the prisons. Only a small handful of professional criminologists, legislators, reformers and professors (including myself, of course) talk about reforming prisons, or doing away with prison life. The vast majority of the public couldn't care less—so long as the officials somehow keep "those people" away from the rest of us. (And who can blame them for feeling that way? And who can blame the prisoners for feeling the way they do?)

But the vast majority of the public does evidently care about the schools and what happens to their children in the schools. So we've got widespread concern and a legitimate debate. That's a guarantee of continuing activity—proposals, counterproposals, confrontations, reconciliations, innovations, reintroduction of old programs—the whole bit. But the debate will go on and that's good.

I am not troubled, either, by the claim of the irrelevance of the schools. Irrelevant to what? What's more relevant? Let us grant that teaching state and national history, as they are often taught, is stupid: a simple function of nationalism, chauvinism and misplaced patriotic zeal. And maybe it's dumb to teach set-theory instead of addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. But those faults are relatively easy to change; and you don't need revolution or street scenes to get them changed. And yes, it's very dumb to insist on teaching Silas Marner when you could use Playboy and Esquire magazines much more effectively. But that too can change, and has changed somewhat. One book burning somewhere out in the Northwest doesn't make a national trend.

Consider, too, that everyone admires, and gapes at, and approves high salaries for professional basketball, baseball, and football players, and movie actors and actresses, and concert musicians. But how do you get to Carnegie Hall or Madison Square Garden or Shea Stadium? The old joke still tells it truly: practice, practice, practice. Hard work; dedication, staying with it through adversity; *caring* deeply about succeeding.

Well, we are not in the business in the schools of training professional performers. But there is a lesson for all of us in what you have to do to be any good at anything: practice, hard work, dedication, caring deeply about succeeding.

So how do we get those motive system or psychic orientations into the schools and school work, and into our children and parents? Well, we can start with the surety that most of them care deeply in one way or another relevant to continuing in school. The problem then becomes one of cultivating that concern; making its exercise interesting; making the newly acquired skills satisfying as they are acquired.

Can we do this for the greater majority of our children? Maybe yes, maybe no. The probability is "no." The probability is that

while a somewhat greater percent of children and parents now care about upward socio-economic mobility than ever cared before, and see schools and schooling as indispensable to that mobility, there will also be a substantial portion of our children who really don't care about those lofty levels of success. They are willing, often eager, to make different bargains with life. And why shouldn't they? And why shouldn't the schools make it possible for them to work out these bargains reasonably well? Isn't there some form of interesting education for them that they will value?

Our deeper problem in this regard lies in the class structuring of the society at large. It still isn't "dignified" or "prestigious" or "estimable" to want to go into the trades or the crafts. And that's not likely to change very much or rapidly at all. (The percent of upper middle class children opting for such lives, or for experiences in communal living, is infinitesimally small, and there is no ground for assuming it will get larger at all). And so we shall have to live with that stratified hierarchy of occupational prestige for a long time to come.

One may wish to change it from the outside by massive political upheaval. But one shouldn't ever make the mistake of thinking the schools can be made an instrument of that kind of fundamental political and social change. People who try to use the schools as such an instrument are at the very best misguided and misinformed, and always dangerous. Interestingly and ironically, they implicitly express great confidence in the role that schools can play when they talk of them as instruments of basic social change. But they are mistaken nevertheless and their programs had better be fought tooth and nail, or else they will destroy the core of extraordinary accomplishment now ingrained in school operations. No social revolution anywhere ever used the schools as instruments of revolution. Rather, after revolutions are made, there is sometimes widespread curricular reform. Sometimes. But revolutions are made outside.

So what is to be done? I'll make a few "simple" recommendations. Like all such simple recommendations, they will be disastrously difficult to implement. But at least they provide an agenda and a set of criteria for evaluating whether we're moving, even if painfully slowly, in the right direction.

These recommendations are to be taken within the context of everything we have learned from Corwin's study about problems of institutionalizing educational reform. So, they do not carry with them any assurance that they can be accomplished, nor any prescriptions for how they might best be accomplished. Rather, they are the kinds of educational structures, processes and relationships that *any* program of educational reform, aimed at improving the education of anybody, minority or majority group, should seek to realize.

First, train enough people, with enough skills, to be able to have enough meaningful contact with children so they can know where they are in their lives and what they are ready to do in school.

Second, keep the numbers of children in any classroom small enough so that the well-trained people can do their jobs. (I don't believe the findings about the irrelevance of class size, for a number of reasons I'll be glad to discuss at length, in case anyone cares).

Third, set each child into motion on various kinds of learning enterprises, in or out of the school, but mostly in the school, that will move the child somewhat further along toward doing something and becoming someone the child wants to do and be, and that we too, in our mature judgements, value. This may vary from hour to hour and day to day. Be prepared for that volatility and to accommodate to it.

Fourth, make sure those task-enterprises are the kind that teach the child, in his own bones, that practice and work are absolutely indispensable to growing.

Fifth, make the stuff interesting in whatever way possible. Sometimes interest, entertainment and the need for hard work don't seem compatible. Some days, then, you will choose to let the child dabble to entertainment; some days not.

Sixth, no child fails. We fail. Children don't fail. They may not get to where they were hoping to get or to where we were hoping to get them. But that doesn't mean they fail. Erase that stigma forever.

Seventh, don't assume that all children, regardless of the problems they bring into the schools, can be effectively contained and taught in the same classrooms or building. Sometimes they can; sometimes they can't. But teachers surely cannot do their most for other children if they have to spend half the time on one child's problematic behavior. Have enough people and resources around to deal with that small handful of children—from all classes, colors and homes—who break up everyone else's chances, but who need their own special chances too.

Eighth, don't ever use color or socio-economic class-background as a predicter of what the child can be. But don't be unrealistic about the different kinds of difficulties you are likely to encounter from children who have different models of success and school-support in their home and community environments. More and different difficulties mean more and different relationships and enterprises. They do not mean—they must never mean—more and less concern.

Ninth, don't assume all children are going the same place in life later on. But don't let that understanding in any way interfere with your concern to do the most you can for each child, wherever they are going. The future garage mechanic is owed as much by the

schools and the teachers as the future doctor and lawyer. Not the same kinds of things. But the same qualities of things, whatever they may be.

The schools can't ever produce equality of outcome; and they can't even give equality of opportunity in its broadest terms. But they can give *equity* in the form of equal, quality education, and make their limited contribution to equality of opportunity that way. That much they owe to every child for as long as the child is in school.

All this is so easy to say—and everyone has said it. But that doesn't make it any the less imperative. It's morally imperative, too, simply because there are no conceivable grounds, in this society at least, for saying some children are entitled to a better education than others.

I don't know how we go about getting all this done. Somehow, we process sixty-million youngsters through our schools every year and they emerge fit to one degree or another for life in this society. No one could possibly coordinate that whole giant mess. But somehow it keeps running. Federal finances will buy programs, times, and resources. It might even be able to buy some new skills, some new kinds of teachers, and maybe some new content. But the final products of our schools are surely going to be extraordinarily uneven. This must be expected. So why have national norms that automatically guarantee that fifty percent of the schools and students will perform "below average" on every measure and test? I don't see much point to such norms at all—except and unless—and these are big qualifications—they are simply used as guidelines to reasonable expectations, given the resources and the input. Used any other way, they are disastrous.

We may have the school system that we should *expect* to have. But that's quite different than saying that we have the system we deserve. Deserving is a matter of moral and political and social entitlement. So our schools may be as good as, if not better than, we could reasonably *expect*, given everything else. But they are far from being as good as we all *deserve*. Maybe we can get a little more of what we all deserve with a little more thought and energy and concern in the coming years. Who knows?

Response to the Papers on Teacher Corps and Educational Reform

by Ronald G. Corwin

The complexity of the topic, educational reform, and the diversity of interests represented among the authors of this series of papers explains the rewarding variety of themes that emerged in the papers. Like the blind men trying to explain the elephant, each of us must be content to grope with limited, often tangential aspects of an overwhelming reality. Melvin Tumin's paper underscores the different realities that government officials, social scientists, and clinicians live with. He says, in effect, that we are not addressing the same realities. So, one must ask, whose problems *can* social science serve and how? Like many of the reform programs that have been evaluated, evaluation research itself often promises too much, for too many, for too many purposes. Macauley once said, "In proportion as men know more, and think more, they look less at individuals and more at classes. They therefore make better theories and worse poems." And, Tumin adds, worse practical advice. Most people probably can tolerate the bad poetry. What we cannot (or should not) tolerate is bad advice. Therefore, Tumin's seemingly outrageous proposal that there might be an inverse correlation between the skills required for analytical model building and clinical engineering is sobering indeed. There is an element of truth in what he says. In fact, perhaps we have neither the research technology and theory *nor* the clinical wisdom to evaluate with much precision the success and failures of massive, complex reform programs.

Yet, perhaps social scientists need not apologize for their abstract models. Abstract knowledge, after all, is not "mere knowledge," or "mere abstraction." It represents about *all* that is cumulative and that can be readily communicated, and thus that can systematically benefit the population at large. No matter how useful in particular instances, the idiosyncratic practical wisdom that accrues to some practitioners by virtue of their intelligence and unique experience is of limited long-term value, for it benefits only a few individual clients, who by happy circumstance, happen to be paired off with these good practitioners. But even thousands of individually excellent teachers do not add up to an *occupation* of excellence. That requires a technology of teaching which is capable of being adapted, improved upon, and passed on to other teachers.

I am glad that Carl and Gloria Grant reminded us of the dubious conclusions reached from other evaluations, especially the controversial Westinghouse study of Headstart programs, which blithely arrived at the kind of definitive, but unfounded conclusions that

policy makers and other concerned citizens understandably want. That study weighed heavily in our decision (that is mine and the Advisory Committee's) that we would not try to reach definitive—and we believed necessarily simple-minded—conclusions about whether or not the Teacher Corps had been "successful," and especially to avoid using test achievement data as a basis for such conclusions. I agree with the Grants that we must confront the issue of what constitutes success and failure in federal intervention programs; but I am not optimistic about the capacity of evaluation research to reach definitive conclusions about the effects of such innovations upon minority groups or any other group in the society. I suspect that at this stage of research technology and knowledge about reform process, success and failure must be measured in modest terms. To be more specific, I doubt if we can do much more than measure the amount of ***effort expended*** in searching for solutions on the part of a multiplicity of groups as a result of federal intervention. To use more definitive "outcome" measures at this time seems arbitrary and probably would be utterly misleading.

The effort-expended measure of success seems at least compatible with the call for diversity of approaches advocated by both professors Fantini and Haberman. That there should be no single model of either schooling or teacher education is echoed by Minnie Koblitz. However, as attractive as diversity is, the call for diversity, inadvertently, could amount to a "cop out." For, the possibility of no change program must be included among the diverse approaches that can be taken. Without a force pushing for at least a few alternative directions of change, there is no guarantee that citizens will opt for change.

I would carry Dr. Fantini's plan a step beyond his own recommendations. For I do not share his belief that there is a high degree of agreement about goals within pluralistic systems. It seems to me that there is a diversity of ***objectives*** as well as means. Even if groups do generally agree on the importance of the four objectives that he identifies, what is crucial is that these same groups are likely to disagree on the ***priorities*** to be attached to these and other objectives. Unless one is willing to impose his own goal priorities, disagreement over priorities will compound the problem of evaluation. Thus, it is not a question of merely assessing the relative effectiveness of different means to achieve a given end. The "ends," and therefore, the reform program, are part of a ***political*** process. In the absence of complete consensus on the objectives and given disagreement about the means, ***power***, as well as consensus, must be involved in reform. I see no way to advance reform apart from power politics, nor to judge the success or failure of a program apart from the views and admittedly often parochial objectives of the particular groups involved. The challenge is to find the blend of power and

value consensus that is most effective for achieving particular purposes.

The fact that power plays a role in reform does not imply that an innovation can be imposed on others by a small group masterminding the change. I do not believe that power is sufficiently concentrated anywhere within the society, or in the system of education, for that to happen (even if it were desirable). It is precisely because there is neither a concentration of power nor consensus that no one model of change can suffice, as both Mario Fantini and Minnie Koblitz have stressed. The Teacher Corps has learned that lesson. Nevertheless, it seems to me that a certain amount of power must be applied (by those who have it), to overcome forces in favor of the status quo, if the conditions that are necessary to accommodate alternative schools or other structures which permit diversity of goals and practices are to come into being.

The various writers alternatively propose, and dismiss, various strategies of change which span a broad spectrum. Dr. Tumin is, correctly, critical of the "charismatic leader" interpretation of change which relies on the "great men" (and women) to advance reform. He also finds little hope, as I did, in invasions throughout the organization by outsiders, when they can be selected and then co-opted by the hosts. Dr. Haberman correctly observes that the Teacher Corps was premised on a self-defeating strategy to recruit and then change *individuals* as a means of reforming the system of education. The Teacher Corps has dissipated much of its efforts by focusing on individuals and by attempting to modify teaching practices within individual classrooms or within components of individual schools. The significance of Dr. Fantini's proposal to involve individual citizens in decision making and to encourage alternative forms of schooling is that these proposals focus on the *structural* levels of education, and more important, they are aimed at reforming the school system rather than individual classrooms. As Dr. Fantini points out, there is nothing in the structure of the Teacher Corps to prevent it from moving in that direction.

Both Professor Fantini and Professor Haberman offer a sound strategy for advancing change: the need to elicit outside public support for any change attempted. Given the diversity of values and interests in our society, we cannot rely on any *one* source of support. Change can be accomplished only through a coalition of forces which includes professionals, academics, administrators, and representatives of various types of citizen groups.

But, as Dr. Haberman emphasizes, changing the structure can be a hollow victory unless there is a knowledge base on which to build and guide the experimentation. We know very little about how to change organizational structures, but we seem to know even less about what to *do* with the opportunities that arise once the structure

has been favorably altered. Thus, including individual citizens in the decision making process might only compound our state of ignorance.

I do not personally think that emphasizing the similarities in the learning problems experienced by disadvantaged and middle-class children, which several of the writers advocate in these papers, will help us to achieve more codified knowledge about how to teach. On the contrary, I think that this stress on the similarities obscures and eclipses important differences among the way different types of individuals learn. Indeed, the myth that low-income children pose no special problems is part of the "delusion of knowledge" referred to by Dr. Haberman. Granted that the learning principles may be universal and apply to all settings, the way they must be applied (the "clinical approach" about which Tumin is concerned) is likely to differ greatly from setting to setting. As the Grants point out, teaching techniques and methods of evaluation must be developed which recognize the different circumstances faced by various minority groups and other members of society.

Despite the stubborn obstacles to the reform of education, and to evaluations of reform efforts that are being attempted, which have been acknowledged in one way or another by all of the authors, the situation should not be seen as hopeless. It is true that we should not be deluded about the extent of our knowledge and power to effect change, nor about our ability to evaluate the results, as Dr. Haberman and as the Grants have cautioned. But we must also recognize that our occasional moments of despair are perhaps as much a product of our high aspirations as of our failures. The fact that we have not been able to accomplish all that some of us have hoped for does not diminish the progress that has been made. The fact is, I believe, that we know much more than we have applied. The challenge is now to put into practice what we do know about the change process. I think these papers have contributed to that task.

8

Summary: Specificity as a Necessary Step to Institutional Reform

by G. Thomas Fox, Jr.

These papers are personal statements and as such have the limitations and excitement that may be expected from strong-willed and productive individuals. I don't want to speak to the excitement that is reflected and may be generated by these papers, because it needs no explication. I would, however, like to point out some issues that may need further discussion. Without emphasizing or re-stating the strong impressions left by these papers, I would like to ask a few questions that an educator may ask of Ron Corwin's study, but where the questions and possible answers have not yet been made clear.

The first two questions that I will ask not only relate to Corwin's study but also to these papers and future discussions on educational reform. They have to do with what certain words mean to observers of education. Although an attempt will be made to answer these questions, the major point is that both the questions and the answers need to be further clarified in order for more dialogue about educational reform to be useful.

Question One: To what extent is education the institution in which it is designed to occur?

There are observers of education who are insisting that it is not possible to consider that educational changes can be made without institutional reorganization. The issues they raise are extremely important when considering educational innovation. Still, I don't think anyone is trying to say that the institutional arrangements are the same thing as the educational process. It would have been very useful if we as readers could identify more clearly what authors (and future discussants) mean by educational innovation. If one is discussing the difficulties in changing educational institutions while another is discussing the possibilities for changing educational content and processes, their conclusions may be very different.

For example, it seems to make sense, both in terms of Ron Corwin's study of Teacher Corps and in terms of other experience in attempting to change institutions (e.g., Tumin's experience with penal institutions) to be very skeptical about the possibilities for changing the institutions of education.

It does not make sense to me to assume, then, that reform of educational processes is to be considered, with seemingly little reflection, with the same skepticism. Educational changes (in both content and process) have taken place within classrooms. (Tumin, the sociologist, is the one author who alludes to some of the changes, e.g., "new math" without, of course, assuming that they reflect "progress").

The point that distinctions exist between the organizational roles within education and the educational content or process has been

raised not because organization and process are necessarily independent but because the discussions represented by these papers leave a little too much to be taken for granted. Corwin's study is about institutional reform. It ends with a call for sophisticated strategies for both implementing and assessing institutional changes within a complex bureaucracy like public education.

The papers, however, especially the papers of educators, seem to assume that the term educational reform is to be interpreted in a second sense; that is, the papers assume that educational reform includes process and content reform as well as institutional reform. I think this assumption makes it difficult to set specific strategies or learn specific lessons from the Corwin study. For example, although Haberman's provocative paper specifically states the necessity for discussing content and process change, the expressed skepticism is towards his profession's inability to affect the organizational structure of educational institutions. The hope that he expresses for his own professional role, however, implies that the content and process of his classroom can change quite readily with a change in clientele. The Grants, on the other hand, caution that educational process and content are not changing for minority groups. They use Project Head Start to illustrate the maddeningly simplistic manner in which different educational processes are currently being assessed.

The point here is that, although each of these papers expresses themes that must be heard and addressed by designers and implementers of educational reform, it probably would do the reader well to begin to identify where institutional reform is being discussed and where it is that educational content and processes are being reviewed.

My general impression is that the educators (except for Koblitz) seem more interested in the possibilities (or limitations) for institutional reform, and the sociologist (Tumin) seems more interested in pursuing the possibilities (or limitations) of instructional content or process reform. My biggest concern with educators' themes on institutional reform, however, is not in their intent, but in the lack of specificity in identifying the organizational network of educational institutions. Certainly these networks are just about universal, one network being applicable to elementary and secondary public and parochial schools, one network being applicable to colleges and universities. When discussing specific strategies for implementing alternatives within these educational institutions, one can expect more specificity into what roles or levels will be changed. As Koblitz implies, we all understand what is the current status of these institutional roles, whether the institutions are located within the inner city, rural or suburban areas.

Is the principal being replaced (or relocated) within the chain of

command, will there be a new organizational relationship between the superintendent and the school board, between the curriculum supervisors and teachers? As common as these roles are within local school systems, it is rather surprising that there are few specific ideas of just what institutional roles will be changed or what new hierarchy is being visualized under the rubric of institutional reform. Reorganization of the institutions for higher education may be even harder to visualize. The autonomy of each professor, the relationship between faculty committees and department deans are not only upheld by tradition but are often displayed as a cornerstone to the fundamental structure of academic freedom. Certainly any vision for new roles within institutions of higher education could benefit from a specification of these roles in terms that all can understand.

The assumption that we know what the organizational hierarchy looks like may be made, but certainly the assumption that we know precisely what roles are in need of being changed cannot be made. In fact, in deference to Professor Fantini's alternative schools, I have seen precious few alternatives for the current organizational network of education. (The alternatives for content and process, however, are relatively rich.)

One example of the disregard for specifying different institutional levels within the educational network is the lack of authors' responses to Tumin's suggestion that charisma is unnecessary and represents a possible reactionary approach to institutional reform. (I can't believe that this suggestion does not hit some sensitive spots.) When discussing institutional reform the necessity for charisma may be minor and even misleading at some levels of the educational institution, but there are also some levels where charisma may be absolutely necessary. One observation that is certainly shared by educators with whom I have met is that a charismatic principal is a necessity for quality education to occur and thrive within a school setting. Not sufficient, but necessary. The reason for this need for local charisma, I think, is not in the unique nature of the educational institution (for I don't think it is so unique when compared to penal or military organizations) but in the nature of education itself. The task of educating is so complex at the "business end" of the system (i.e., the classroom) that there is a need for a charismatic simplifying of the chaotic, irrational realities of the classroom.

In terms of task complexity and difficulty and lack of past success to emulate, the institutional hierarchy is turned upside down when considering the educational processes. The power plays and coordination of the complex networks of education (addressed by Corwin) are not nearly as chaotic and in need of personal interpretation and energy as the everyday tasks undertaken by the school

teacher. Although charisma, personal tenacity and concentrated vision may not be so necessary for the top level managers within the educational hierarchy to get their jobs done (in terms of supporting or encouraging educational goals) it becomes absolutely necessary as one gets closer to classroom payoff. Of course what "charisma" means in different classroom or school settings may be quite different, but it includes a strong, personal communication of a definite commitment to action that I think Tumin suggests is not necessary at the higher end of an institution's chain of command in order for institutional reform to occur. A closer attention to the detail of roles within educational institutions is necessary to our discussion of reform strategies.

Another example of the need for greater specificity is this. Tumin, again speaking from personal experience in penal reform, suggests that there is a real gulf between the professional practitioners and the social scientist. The practitioner handles on-the-spot decisions, the theoretician is more concerned with consistencies and explanations. No educator suggests the possibility that the analogy between penal institutions and educational institutions may be too tenuous for the expressed dilemma to be similar. The differences, again, may not be between the two institutional organizations but within the classroom complexities in applying educational processes. For example, within many levels of an educational institution each person is both a "practitioner" and a "theoretician" of the educational process: most educators are both theoreticians and practitioners. In education, the dilemma is more a personal dilemma than a difference in professional craft (or class). The lack of communication between educators may not necessarily occur between theoretician and non-theoretician as Tumin suggests, but between theory-practice A, theory-practice B, theory-practice C, etc., where both theory and practice are not being well specified.

When the dilemma is between the contradictory nature of two professional crafts, it must be addressed one way. For example, by introducing an intermediate role that is to interpret theory into practical terms. If the dilemma is within the craft itself, however, it should be addressed in a different way. For example, by clearly specifying the relationship between theory-practice A, comparing that with theory-practice B, etc. An intermediate role may not only be extraneous to addressing the dilemmas within the craft itself, it can often confound these dilemmas by assuming that either the relationships between theory and practice already have been defined or that one side represents theory and the other side represents practice. Only rudimentary beginnings have been made towards clarifying certain relationships between educational theory and practice (e.g., relationships between behavioral psychology, the Tyler Rationale and classroom practices). To assume that the

problem is a communication dilemma between different kinds of experts is to miss one of the greatest challenges to educators that Teacher Corps represents. The challenge is not to theoreticians to become more practical (or vice-versa) but to our current understandings of what the educational process is in the first place. One necessary step for future discussion about educational change to be beneficial is to identify the relationships between certain theories and practices and then to clarify where the application of alternative theory/practices needs institutional or process changes.

To conclude these informal comments about the need for more specific detailing of both educational processes and educational institutions, I would like to tell a story (that occurred when I was a sixth-grade teacher) of someone who knew the difference between the two.

On a fine spring day I gave the students an assignment to go anywhere, think and write down their thoughts best that they could in order to communicate them in written words to each of the rest of us. Twelve-year-old, red-haired Bill ended up walking down the city streets that day, miles from our school and blocks from any school, with pencil and pad in hand, stopping sometimes briefly, sometimes not, to write. As he paused by a road sign to get his bearings, a policeman drove up, braked, rushed out of the patrol car and exploded:

"What are you doing here, sonny?"

"I'm thinking."

"*Thinking!* You're supposed to be in school!"

Of course the policeman was right. It may also be the case, however, that the two (thinking and school) may go together in some way. It would be interesting for us educators to discuss that possibility in specific terms of what school is and in specific terms of what thinking is.

I have said earlier that I had two questions about the meanings of some of the words we use when discussing educational reform. In addition to hoping that the passion expressed by educators is towards specific educational practices or specific institutional arrangements, I would also like to understand better what is meant by educators' use of the word "change."

Question Two: In what respect are we discussing educational change and in what respect are we discussing educational reform?

In addition to specifying particular institutional or process/content alternatives, future discussion may be clarified by a more conscious usage of the words change and reform. For example, although the first word in the title to Ron Corwin's book is "reform," the words

most used by both Corwin and the responses of educators is "change" (and sometimes "innovation"), when referring to the possibilities for providing a quality education for all. There are distinctions between these two words that, if used correctly, could make future discussions about the possibilities for affecting educational practice a little more clear.

To change is to make different. The term itself need have no moral tone; one can change a tire or change one's habits without implying that there is something wrong with the current condition. To change also implies that there is a distinctly different state from what had been. Compare, for example, the difference between changing one's opinions or altering one's opinion. The extent of a change always needs to be further clarified and described.

Considered in terms of nineteenth-century optimism and a mechanistic view of human behavior and societies in general, it is important to note the positive connotation of change. Change, when considered with an assumption of continued progress in a mechanistic world, can easily become a non-moralistic goal. Change and innovation begin to imply a universal good if progress can always be assumed.

Current interest in education, however, as can be seen from Tumin's or the Grants' papers, reflects very moral perspectives about what is right for each person within our schools. This moral concern towards the imperative reality of a quality education for all, along with the increased awareness that change or "progress" is not inevitably for the better, may bring more professional consideration that "reform" may in some cases be a more appropriate word than "change."

Reform has a number of connotations that are different from change. One of the first connotations is that there is something wrong with the present state of affairs. Not mechanically wrong, morally wrong. One does not reform a tire, one reforms his conduct. In addition, reform is not only improvement of conduct, it also is a return to a former or better state. A reformer not only is expected to know the state to which he is returning, he probably has experienced this state before. Reform, then, is to abandon wrong or evil ways of conduct and return to more morally acceptable conduct. It includes a greater attention to the removal of faults, wrongs or abuses than the more neutral or positivistic term "change."

The differences between "change" and "reform" when applied to education are interesting to consider. If a mathematics supervisor is discussing reform of the elementary mathematics program, he may be referring to something quite different from the mathematics professor who is discussing change of the elementary mathematics program. Reform, of course, is seldom used by educators when discussing their educational plans. Tumin, for example, is the only

author in this collection who suggests that, perhaps, it is reform of the educational process that is a viable goal for quality education for all. In fact, it may be that the demands of current disenfranchised groups represented as clients by Teacher Corps are not esoteric calls for the "changes" and "innovations" represented so often in our educational journals, but are basically calls for reform: for example, that high school graduates be able to read and write.

Teacher Corps, after all, is not basically a new bureaucracy installed to promote educational change. It reflects an interest in education from the moral perspective that quality education is a right of each person within our schools. This moral concern, along with the increased awareness that change or "progress" is not inevitably for the better, may bring more professional consideration that "reform" may in some cases be a more appropriate term than "change." It should be recognized, however, that the professional use of this term would imply that there are moral wrongs being included in current educational practices. The paper of the Grants (and to some extent, also Fantini's) refers to some of these immoral practices but still discusses educational change as a kite in the wind. More discussion about reform of current educational practices may bring us back to earth again: in terms of what is possible, of what we (professionals and public) know from our own educational experience and in terms of what is humane.

It is Tumin, the sociologist, who states the most clear proposition of just what educational reform may mean when applied to the clients represented by Teacher Corps (see his remarks in his reaction paper). His modest suggestion that perhaps no educational change is needed for these clients other than making their education of the same quality as it is for other groups seems startlingly simple. No need for slogans about educational innovation. No necessity for restructuring educational institutions. No more fancy definitions of accountability other than neighborhood involvement with local schools. No need for us to beat the air and apologize for how little we know or how small we feel. As modest as this suggestion is, it does seem to relate to institutional survival and may be worthy of being addressed by current educators and economists. By "addressed" I mean seriously considered and made clear by educators and economists whether quality schooling can actually be achieved for all.

There is one last point that I can't help making when discussing the need for identifying those educational practices that need to be reformed (not merely changed). It will probably not be easy for educators to begin to use the term reform instead of change. The current rhetoric of change and innovation represented by so many educators is not only less damaging professionally but less capable

of being assessed. We all know that within an institution and a profession it is extremely difficult to admit professional wrongs and to open assessment of corrections of these wrongs to outside groups. If using this will to admit professional wrongs does not require "charisma" it certainly requires a strong sense of self and personal responsibility that cannot be assumed to be present in many of us professional educators (or professional lawyers or doctors, for that matter).

When discussing educators' role and use of expertise in implementing educational reform (either institutional or process reform), Haberman's thesis that educators, especially teacher educators, have had and probably will have little to offer, can be called to question. Reform, after all, is an inside process that only can be accomplished by the practitioner. Events can change my behavior but only I can reform my habits. Similarly educational reform must depend upon the will of the current practitioners of education. To expect that reform can be produced from without is almost a contradiction in terminology, reform necessarily must include efforts from within the profession itself.

In summary, these papers suggest that there are some lessons to be learned before either the Corwin report or future studies can be made useful for educational policy makers. One of the first lessons is that in a field where the ideal state always far outreaches the possible or the real, it would do policymakers or policy designers good to be specific about what is meant by "educational reform." Is it change or is it reform, and what is being altered: educational content, instructional processes, the institutions of education or all of these. We can be more specific, both in our questions and in stating the lessons that we have learned from past experience.

The concentrated efforts upon the reform of current practices within specific classroom settings warrant our attention, involvement and concern both as educators and as citizens committed to quality education for all youngsters in the U.S. An awareness of the possibilities and events that have occurred lend themselves neither to a consideration of a utopian state where wishes (no matter how humanitarian or often stated) are automatically granted, nor a hell where all action and changes of direction are illusionary. In the current situation, the major truth is that for quality education to occur, even to the extent that it used to occur, will take damn hard work, precious few "eurekas" and probably no elegant solutions to the every day dilemmas represented within our classrooms, within our educational institutions and within our ideals for the educational process. Possibly one of the best ways to get out of the personalized manner in which we educators have structured the complexities of education is to talk to other interested parties who

may not share the same assumptions that seem to limit our current perspectives.

Finally, I would like to point out four specific observations made in the Corwin study that demand great attention by educators. First is the observation that the more classroom teachers were involved in the planning process, the less substantial were the changes in the role and processes included in interns' training. Second is the suggestion that the educational community does not reflect a corporate-like structure where decisions are made at the top and implemented through each successive echelon of responsibility. It is more like a feudal community where power is kept by local agencies (LEA's, school districts, principals, classroom teachers) that have strong defenses against "outside" force. Third is the attention given the disillusioning process of developing a prospective "teacher" from an "intern." The most realiable data included in Corwin's provocative study is the amount of discouraging information about schools that every intern had to cope with in a personal way (most felt discouraged, many left). Fourth are the large differences between the nature of the educational community represented by local schools and the educational community represented by institutions of higher education. In fact, one could say that what the Corwin study actually monitored was the result of cultural shock—of the interns, the professors and the teachers, each shocked by a culture that they had not experienced in years.

Some of these four points can be further documented by other studies; some are contradictory to certain educational assumptions, and some may be assimilated with the reader's common sense and educational experience. Although it is not my intent to perform the needed documentation here, there are some examples that come quickly to mind. The first point, that the more teachers involved, the less substantial were the changes within the interns' programs seems to contradict the assumption in current change rhetoric that the wider the representation, the greater the possibility for change. It may also enforce the idea expressed here that Teacher Corps may not necessarily represent change (an amoral step in progress) but reform (the righting of a moral wrong). In this case one would expect practitioners to be resistant; it is their conduct that is being reformed. Notice that the second point does not say that there is no systematic structure common to school systems, but that the decision-making process and locus of power and responsibility do not perform as designed. Certainly that point coincides with most observations of schooling today. The third and fourth points, that interns receive a lot of discouraging information about teaching and that universities and school systems are really two distinct and independent communities may be considered to be closely related. In a recent AERA meeting, Harry Wolcott, an anthropolo-

gist, described these two educational communities as being like two "moieties," an anthropological term denoting two independent societies within the same culture. The rules for success and achievement at the university level (where the intern's current membership lies) are far different than the rules for success and achievement in the public school classroom. The issues are far more complex and in need of immediate action within the public school classroom than within the university setting. Personally, I would like to see this point pursued in more detail, especially in terms of what can be expected in mutual cooperation between these two moieties. Each of these four points, however, is extremely important to real considerations for implementing educational reform.

One final challenge represented by the Corwin study is that many of the more interesting observations, statements and suggestions can be questioned on insufficient evidence or lack of appropriate methodology. Many of the observations, for example, lend themselves more to an anthropological tradition of participant-observer than the post-hoc kind of data analysis that is the heart of the Corwin study. The challenge, however, is not to find out where doubt or controversy may arise but to either erase the doubt by further study or to roll up our sleeves, act accordingly with some of the suggestions and see where that action takes us. For change or reform to take place in any context, the challenge is one of hard work, action and maneuverability within the recognized limits of performance. The Corwin study suggests some of the limiting factors for producing educational reform that go beyond the strategy of using interns as change agents. What these response papers tell us is that we educators still have much to learn about the limits that we should expect to meet as we attempt to provide quality educations for all children. Knowing these limitations, of course, is not the same as limiting the moral and professional imperative for making schooling a humanistic and potential seeking experience for children from every American home. Recognizing the real limitations is only one necessary step to increasing and improving upon our current performance.